DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 332 HE 001 906

TITLE	Target for the 70's. Papers Presented at the Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C. Office of Information and Research.
PUB DATE	70
NOTE	86p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Suite 700, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Innovation, Governance, *Higher Education, International Education, *Negro Students, *State Colleges, *State Universities, Student Participation, Urban Education

ABSTRACT

The papers delivered at this meeting of the AASCU fell in the following categories: (1) Higher Education for the 70's, with a long paper by Paul Woodring, and brief statements by eight other speakers; (2) State Colleges and Universities in the 70's, with papers by E. Alden Dunham, "Colleges and the Forgotten Americans, A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities," and by Fred F. Harcleroad, "Historical Background, Current Status and Future Plans of the Developing State Colleges and Universities;" (3) The Black Student of the 70's, with two papers by Herman R. Branson and Gwen Patton and two brief statements by Ernest D. Mason and William B. Boyd; (4) New Ideas for the 70's, which included papers on resident colleges for individualized learning, preadmission programs for the academically deficient, new sources of private support, mobilizing alumni support, the common market plan for students in a state college, campus governance, and computer assisted instruction; (5) Urban Higher Education for the 70's, with papers by Richard C. Van Dusen, James A. Reid, James A. Hayes, and Carlisle Parker; (6) International Education for the 70's, with a paper by William Martin; and (7) The School, the Scholar and Society, with a paper by O. Meredith Wilson. (AF)

ED0 46332

TARGET FOR THE 70's

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Papers presented at the

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

November 1969
Atlanta, Georgia

HE001906

Library of Congress
Catalogue Card Number 63-22127

PRICE $1.00

Published in 1970

by the

American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Suite 700, One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036

Table of Contents

Page

Higher Education for the 70's

Paul Woodring . . . 1
Edward Callan . . . 7
Frank Dickey . . . 7
E. Alden Dunham . . . 8
Clarence W. Friedman . . . 9
Winfred L. Godwin . . . 10
Fred F. Harcleroad . . . 10
Jack Harrison . . . 11
Watts Hill, Jr. . . . 12

State Colleges and Universities in the 70's

E. Alden Dunham
"Colleges of the Forgotten Americans"–A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities . . . 17
Fred F. Harcleroad
Historical Background, Current Status and Future Plans of the Developing State Colleges and Universities . . . 21

The Black Student of the 70's

Herman R. Branson . . . 27
Gwen Patton . . . 31
Ernest D. Mason . . . 34
William B. Boyd . . . 34

New Ideas for the 70's

Harold B. Crosby
Organizing Resident Colleges for Individualized Learning . . . 39
Thomas Y. Whitley
A Preadmissions Program for the Academically Deficient . . . 41
E. Lee McLean
New Sources of Private Support . . . 42
Edgar Masterson
Mobilizing Alumni Support . . . 45
G. Theodore Mitau
The Common Market Plan for Students in a State College System . . . 47
William E. Davis
Campus Governance . . . 51
Albert Brown
Increasing Quality and Economy Through Computer-Assisted Instruction . . . 56

Page

Urban Higher Education for the 70's

Richard C. Van Dusen 61
James A. Reid 64
James A. Hayes 66
Carlisle Parker 68

International Education for the 70's

William Martin. 73

The School, the Scholar and Society

O. Meredith Wilson. 81

Contributors. 88

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE 70's

PAUL WOODRING
EDWARD CALLAN
FRANK DICKEY
E. ALDEN DUNHAM
CLARENCE W. FRIEDMAN
WINFRED L. GODWIN
FRED F. HARCLEROAD
JACK HARRISON
WATTS HILL, JR.

5

PAUL WOODRING

The topic—Higher Education in the 70s—makes it necessary to look ahead and to make some predictions though making predictions is always a risky enterprise because the crystal ball is inevitably cloudy.

I recall some of the predictions that we made a decade ago. We knew at that time that enrollments were going to grow, but most of us underestimated the magnitude of the growth, particularly in colleges such as are represented here. We predicted a serious shortage of college teachers, and in this case we overestimated the size of the shortage.

But most of us failed to predict that during the 60's the quiet generation of the 50's would be replaced by the noisiest generation in history. We failed to anticipate that psychedelic drugs would replace alcohol as a campus problem. Maybe I shouldn't say replace, maybe just added to it.

We failed to predict the violence that would overtake many campuses and make the college presidency one of the most hazardous jobs in the nation. I recall that in 1955 one distinguished university president protested that students were too quiet, too easy-going, too uninterested in the affairs of the world and said, somewhat ironically, that at least employers would like them for their docility. That man's name was Clark Kerr.

We failed to anticipate these things either because we underestimated the stresses and strains within our society or because we did not really understand the oncoming generation. This generation, I am convinced, is different qualitatively, and I predict that the generation coming to maturity will be still different, enough different to make the student of the 60's seem old fashioned.

Some of the changes of the 60's can be reduced to figures. Since 1960, the total enrollment of American institutions of higher learning has doubled. The percentage of the total enrolled in publicly supported institutions has grown from about 59 per cent to 70 per cent, which means that state colleges have more than doubled their enrollment. Many have tripled or quadrupled.

Another reason the anticipated shortage did not develop was the rise in faculty salaries, which have about doubled since 1960, and thus increased our holding power.

Now, looking ahead, enrollment growth will continue into the 70's, but after the mid-70's the rate of growth will slow and the growth may stop altogether before 1980. The reason for this is found in the annual number of live births, which fell from a high of 4.3 million in 1967 to 3.5 million last year.

After the mid-70's, the number reaching the age of 18 each year will decline until by the mid-80's the number will be about 20 per cent smaller than it is today. This is not a guess. This is a fact, because all the babies have been born and counted.

Although the percentage of the age group going to college will continue to rise for a time, it is not likely to rise rapidly enough to offset the declining number within the age group. It may well be that the percentage going to college may reach a plateau before that time. It has to reach a plateau sometime before it reaches a hundred percent. And many of the young people desiring education beyond the secondary level will enter vocational training rather than programs specifically called college education.

But the most important developments of the 60's are ones not easily reduced to figures. Although I cannot produce statistics to prove it, I think it's safe to say that life on the college campus has undergone more change during the decade just ended than in the previous half century. The most notable changes have not been in the classroom where the lecture system still prevails, nor in the curriculum, which remains much as it was in 1960 except in a few experimental colleges, cluster colleges and a few programs of ethnic studies, but the transformation of student life during out-of-class hours, and consequently the quality of the total college experience, has been dramatic.

Most of these changes were not planned by administrators. They resulted from mounting pressures which college officials were unable to resist because they reflected the greater permissiveness in the society around us, especially in the homes from which the students come.

Though it is often said that the doctrine of in loco parentis is being rejected, I think it would be more accurate to say that parents, having themselves given up all efforts to control the personal lives of their sons and daughters of college age, no longer expect college officials to exert such control.

Today's students are scarcely aware that only a few years ago most colleges made a vigorous effort to enforce rules governing students' dress, dormitory hours and sexual behavior and that each dormitory had a house mother to enforce the regulations. They cannot recall a day when faculty chaperons were present at college dances.

Within a single decade, the parietal rules that once governed the personal behavior of students have been all but swept away. Today, on a great many campuses, students dress as they please. A girl may wear the shortest of mini-skirts or she may choose cowboy dungarees and boots. A boy may wear shoulder-length hair, as much of a beard as his immaturity enables him to grow and a costume straight from Carnaby Street.

Rules governing dormitory hours have almost disappeared, and on a growing number of campuses boys and girls now are free to visit each other's rooms. House mothers, dormitory matrons and chaperons have passed into history.

Although marijuana, psychedelic drugs and, at most colleges, alcohol remain on the prohibited list, it's safer to use such drugs on campus than off because little effort is made to enforce the rules and because when infractions are discovered, college officials are more lenient than the police and the courts in dealing with them.

Future historians will report that during the late 1960's American college students enjoyed more personal freedom and more protection from the police than did adults who were not in college.

Perhaps I have overstated a bit. It may be that some of you are presidents of colleges which still make an effort to enforce parietal

7

rules. The trends of which I speak do seem to be somewhat farther along on the West Coast and on the East Coast than in the South or the Middle West. But I predict that during the 1970's any college administrator who attempts to tell his students what they may wear and what hours they may keep or who tries to keep boys and girls out of each other's dormitory rooms will have a hard time. Most, I think, will just give up and find some convenient rationalization for doing so.

Now that college students have gained most of the personal freedom they want, they are turning their attention to other reforms in higher education and demanding a role in policy making. Such demands will, I think, become a major preoccupation during the decade just ahead and a major source of conflict. A number of institutions already have given students seats on curriculum committees and other policy making bodies, and a few have given them seats on boards of regents or trustees. Few is not quite the right word. According to the National Observer, more than one hundred higher education institutions in the United States now have seated either students or recent graduates on boards of trustees.

But opposition to student participation in policy making is mounting, and since most of it comes from the faculty rather than from administrators, it seems likely that the major confrontations of the 70's will be between students and faculty.

The college president, if he is wise and skillful, will avoid becoming the center of the storm, as he has often been during the conflicts of the 60's. In some cases, as when students demand better teaching and more attention to undergraduates, the president's sympathies may well be with the students. I think the president might be quite wise to let the students and faculty fight it out while he, the president, sits back, strokes his beard and says, in effect, "Go to it, boys." He should avoid being the principal target of attack.

During the past half century, American professors have gained greatly in power at the expense of administrators. Today, in most institutions of higher learning, it is the faculty or some council or committee made up of faculty members that decides what shall be taught and who shall teach it. In most cases, the faculty makes policy concerning student admissions and establishes standards for graduation. And the faculty, operating within the department, usually decides what kind of new faculty members shall be employed and which of its own members shall be retained and promoted.

To be sure, the administrator has a veto power, but if he uses it very often he will find himself in trouble. Having gained all of this power, the faculties are understandably reluctant to share it with students, and they offer many persuasive arguments against student participation in policy making.

They are especially reluctant to let students take part in deciding which faculty members shall be retained and promoted. They know that students would place a greater emphasis on teaching and less on research. Many faculty members have secret doubts about their own competence as teachers—some of them with good reason.

As for students on curriculum committees, the professors point to the fact that no one can be qualified to decide whether any given subject should be in the curriculum until he himself has knowledge of that subject. The faculty as a group presumably has a thorough knowledge of all the possible elements of the curriculum. Very few individual faculty members have, of course.

Students have only begun to acquire such knowledge. They are prone to reject those parts of which they are ignorant. The faculty also contends that standards for graduation should represent something more stable than the likes and dislikes of those who are asked to meet the standards.

Though there is much truth in all this, I still think the students can play a useful role in policy making. I'm not proposing that they be given a majority vote but only that their voices be heard and listened to. Though they cannot judge the research competency of professors, I think they know more than either administrators or faculty members about who the good teachers are, and their knowledge should not be ignored when promotions are made.

Though they lack some of the knowledge essential to sound curriculum making, they can sometimes see defects which the faculty has been indoctrinated in graduate school to ignore. They know, for example, that it's fallacious for a first course in psychology, physics or history to be designed as though every student in the class were determined to become a psychologist, a physicist or a historian.

There is some point to their demand for relevance, even though many students seem confused when we ask "Relevant to what?" But students can play an effective role in policy making only if the institution is small enough so that students' chosen representatives can accurately reflect the majority view.

This is one of many reasons why I am convinced that the larger undergraduate schools, some of which now enroll ten or twenty thousand undergraduates, or more, must break up into smaller units of five or six hundred each. Each of these units should have a name, a clear sense of identity, its own purpose, its own student body, its own basic faculty of individuals who like to teach undergraduates and who do it well. This would be a specially selected kind of faculty.

Each of the units would have access to the libraries, laboratories and playing fields of the parent institution. In some cases the students might take their academic majors and professional training from the faculty of the parent university but they would identify with the smaller unit where they would be known as individuals, not as numbers.

For the past three years I have been involved, at Western Washington College in Bellingham, in the development of a cluster college system such as I have described. Western is not yet called a university. It was only recently authorized to grant the Ph.D. degree and is not large by university standards. But with more than 8,000 undergraduates, it's much too large to operate effectively as a single unit.

In a unit of this size, communication breaks down, misunderstandings are multiplied and hostilities grow. The students and faculty do not really know each other, and neither knows the administration. I watched this happen in my own institution. I went there when we had 800 students and 60 faculty members. Within two months I knew every faculty member by name. Now I don't know a third of our faculty of 400.

The first year I was there, I could watch the student graduation line and name half or two-thirds of them as they went by. Today I sit at graduation ceremonies and the students walking by are a group of strangers.

Most of my present involvement is with Fairhaven College, a liberal arts satellite of Western, with its own dormitories which are living and learning units. Seminars are held in dormitory lounges equipped with sofas, rather than steel or plastic chairs. Each lounge has a fireplace.

Because Fairhaven is limited to 600 students, we know our students and they know us. Students play an active part in policy making as members of curriculum committees, admissions committees and faculty selection committees. Although we are encountering some of the anticipated problems, I am increasingly convinced that in a college of this size students can play an effective part in policy making.

And although any college that promises more student participation inevitably attracts more than its share of activists and eager reformers, we have had no significant campus disorders because there is no establishment, no vast bureaucracy for the students to protest against. Gradually it dawns upon the students that they are the system and that they are on the way to becoming a part of the establishment. This is a maturing experience that students in larger institutions miss.

Western plans to add more satellite colleges as the demand for them grows. I hope eventually we'll have 10 or 12. Already the board of trustees has authorized the establishment of a college of environmental studies and a college of ethnic studies. More liberal arts units and perhaps some professional units will come later. At present, however, instead of having undergraduate professional units, students in each unit may choose to prepare for teaching. About half the students at Fairhaven are planning to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and I think we're offering the kind of undergraduate liberal education that is a good preparation for teaching.

I am hopeful that Western Washington may provide a model for other colleges with histories similar to our own, colleges that began as normal schools, became teachers colleges, then became general state colleges and are now developing into some of the characteristics of universities. At least you can learn from our mistakes, and I hope we can demonstrate that the cluster college approach is the best way to preserve sound undergraduate education, including liberal education and teacher education, in an expanding institution which otherwise is prone to develop graduate schools at the expense of the undergraduate program.

If colleges such as ours attempt to become instant Harvards or if they try to emulate the Big Ten universities, they will lose their integrity as undergraduate colleges without becoming better than third-grade universities. If they will show some imagination, however, reject the conventional university model—which has not worked very well even in the conventional places—and make a real effort to provide the kind of education that today's students want and need, they can become distinctive, first-rate universities of a new kind.

A new university might consist of a departmentalized faculty sufficiently large to provide the academic majors in a small but good graduate program. It would place the major emphasis on developing a cluster of satellite undergraduate colleges, each differing from the others. One might offer a conventional faculty-made curriculum, have rigid entrance standards, use a traditional grading system and require a conventional major. Others would allow more student participation in policy making, and this might result in a pass-fail grading system and an interdisciplinary major, majors in the social studies or in the humanities rather than in a single subject.

At the far left there might be one college specifically designed to drain off those students most alienated from the adult world. This might have some of the characteristics of the free universities that are springing up all over the country. Students in this one might discover that a degree from a college with no entrance standards, no required curriculum and a minimum of faculty control would have no value, but it would be just as well to let them discover this for themselves. They will not believe it if we tell them.

Some of the colleges in the cluster would be residential institutions designed as living and learning units where the educational process doesn't stop when the student leaves class but goes on for 24 hours a day. Others would be planned for commuters or for those who desire to live off campus. The student, then, would choose his style of life, his curriculum and his degree of freedom at the time he chooses his college. It should be possible, of course, to move back and forth among them as the student changes his mind, but because he has made a choice about the degree of freedom and participation that he wants, he would have less to protest against.

Each faculty member could also choose the college in which he thought he could work most effectively. At the time we set up Fairhaven, I sent a questionnaire to all our prospective faculty asking, "Would you like to take part in this kind of an institution where your entire responsibility is for undergraduates, no graduate students, no majors; it's for undergraduate liberal education?"

People told me that no faculty member would want to be in such a place. We found that of our faculty of three hundred about one-third of them said, "Yes, I would like to take part."

About a third said, "Well, it sounds like a good idea but I have other involvements." About a third thought the whole plan was terrible and wished we'd go ahead and become a conventional university which started majors in the freshman year and forgot liberal education. But about a third of them would like to take part. I'm convinced that there are in the nation plenty of faculty members who would like to devote themselves to undergraduate teaching if we'll not rig the status symbol, the promotion, in such a way as to reward research and neglect teaching. We must readjust the entire system of promotions, and we can do it in this kind of college.

Perhaps there are better solutions. But of one thing I feel certain; colleges now becoming universities cannot solve their problems by following the conventional university pattern which robs the undergraduate in an effort to support graduate work and research. Because patterns in such colleges are not yet rigidly fixed, they can do better, and they ought to do better.

EDWARD CALLAN

I'm sure that over the past few years a good number of you have prayed for a more apathetic student community. Though you see no evidence of apathy now, it does exist and I see it as a potential problem.

There are obvious differences between today's campuses and the complacent campuses of the 50's. But I'm worried about a possible recurrence of this apathy—this lack of concern—and I feel we need action now to prevent it from happening again.

My concern, like yours, is for the students on the campus and the need to serve them better. What can we do to improve the present system of serving them? Right now, our student governments are in a state of transition from being social organizations to being really representative ones. To speed this transformation along and to make it even more valid we need greater participation from the student body. Student governments must have the respect and involvement of their student populations for their actions to carry weight in campus decision making.

I think student governments should move in the direction of corporations, with students as equal shareholders in the services and growth of their company. What are now student fees would become substantial yearly investments from the individual stockholder, who would be encouraged to use his stockholder privileges to vote for his corporate board of officers and to enjoy the programs and full services provided through his investment—plays, athletic events, newspapers, radio stations, concerts and all the other benefits of student government.

Profits should be translated into dividends shared at the end of the year; elected officers would report to the student body.

Student involvement and concern will increase greatly if it is made obvious that the student government is serving the student. This kind of financial investment will increase interest and involvement in future years.

FRANK DICKEY

Critics of higher education administration have claimed on many occasions that modern administration tends to isolate the individuals and groups on the campus one from the other. It seems to me, however, that sound administrative practice should serve to reconstruct the campus as a social machine. This task of reconstruction will require strong leadership. Although Harold Lasky, Jacques Barzun and many others have decried the power of American college administrators, I suggest that such power is not as brutish as they imply, nor should it ever be allowed to become brutal to the vitality of genuine scholarship.

I hold that the most important single change needed in higher education in the 70's is to direct more attention to management in our institutions. I realize that in some quarters management is a dirty word, but whatever the function is called, it is basically that of using available resources to relate programs to the objectives sought, in the best possible ways. In another sense, it is the implementation of planning and the recurrent application of evaluative processes to the operations of units and institutional entities.

Management, in whatever terms it should be dressed, is quite likely the single most important requirement of the university or college in the next decade. The term as used here means, fundamentally, academic management.

The preparation of persons to execute this broader meaning, however, is usually very meager, if present at all. A part of the management function may consequently come to be a program of intermittent preparation for department chairmen, deans and other academic administrators, practically all of whom reach their position with preparation only for activities and demands of an entirely different nature.

I would advocate that we give significant attention in these years ahead to the development of the academic management process.

E. ALDEN DUNHAM

I will be blunt and make several dogmatic, perfectly outrageous points.

The crisis in higher education is part and parcel of a general consumer rebellion in the United States – housewives versus the supermarket, blacks versus the schools, patients versus medical care and costs. Ralph Nader is now a popular folk hero. The public is angry.

In higher education this anger is fundamentally due to the gap between public expectations and professional expectation over the purpose of higher education. The public pays to have its children educated. The profession works to advance knowledge.

This gap is in turn due to the overriding influence of the graduate school of arts and sciences and the research Ph.D. as the model of what is respectable.

The Ph.D. is a research degree and as such is inappropriate for most college teaching positions. All the current ills on college campuses are tied in one way or another to the inappropriateness of faculty training. The Ph.D. is an anachronism when it serves as the sole badge of competence in an age of mass higher education.

A prestigious teaching degree is a necessary alternative if the gap between public and professional expectations is to be closed. Make no mistake about it; the public will demand that this gap be closed.

The doctor of arts, D.A. degree, should become that new degree, cutting across all fields of the arts and sciences and aimed at the training of college teachers for two- and four-year colleges, with special emphasis on lower division teaching.

The time is right for this major revolution in higher education, and the strongest of the state colleges and regional universities should take the lead in introducing this new degree. They should, on the other hand, resist pressures for Ph.D. programs which are neither in their interest nor in the interest of the public.

REV. CLARENCE W. FRIEDMAN

In the 70's, there will be a struggle for the recognition of human dignity. In the 1960's, education—perhaps one should say the entire nation—has discovered man as a loving, affective human being. As an affective, loving human being, he is going to demand the recognition of his dignity.

What this really means is that education will have to throw back the influence of 30 years of war. These years have exercised a tremendous impact on higher education, making it impossible to recognize legitimate aspirations. Students at the present time are exploring this.

Your institutions have, in the past, exhibited a tremendous sympathy for the poor, and this reflects one of the legitimate aspirations I'm talking about.

Somehow we will have to concern ourselves again with the ideas and the ideals of America as these are found in the Declaration of Independence, in the Constitution and as we daily experience them. The era of fighting communism is over. It has no appeal to the human being, and there isn't any reason why he should become an instrument in a battle which he sees has absolutely no appeal to him whatsoever. He, more than we, probably realizes that communism and all the other isms have lost their dynamic appeal.

In a certain sense, the university, which is at the present time the most sophisticated agency in our society, will have to play the role which once was assigned to the Christian church. The Christian church—or any church, as you very well know—no longer has a major impact on our society. As educators, particularly in higher education, we will have to assume, at least in part, the role the church has played in giving man something by which he could live as a human being.

WINFRED L. GODWIN

We must speed up considerably our attention to necessary changes in the overall structure and process of our higher education system. In public higher education we can support and accelerate forces for change within institutions by encouraging state level planning agencies to give top attention to possible basic changes in the total system. Thus far, planning and coordination in American higher education have merely tinkered with the existing institutional framework and hardly affected the basic educational process.

Few have been satisfied with the results, possibly because both institutions and government recognize that fundamental issues were left out of the planning assignment. Most of the input, however, has been from within the educational and political establishment, and one thing we must do in any future planning effort in higher education is to involve more of the top creative talent in our population.

Many creative people are now excluded--intellectuals, professionals, corporate officials, community and minority group leaders and others outside the existing political and educational establishment. Yet their understanding of individual development and social dynamics needs to be applied to the search for valid educational change. Because they are not beholden to special interests, they just might generate some of the public backing necessary to support drastic educational change.

More comprehensive higher education planning should attend to:

- forms of post-secondary educational experience we might offer young people as alternatives to formal enrollment in a college or a university;
- a candid delineation of curriculum, teaching and other changes required if our post-secondary institutions are to serve the increasing cultural pluralism in our society;
- whether and how a mass higher education enterprise can also be the major locus of rigorous and advanced intellectual activity. If this is to be the purpose of the university, how will other kinds of institutions define and maintain their own integrity?
- what extent we need to rely more on financial support of students rather than institutions as one avenue of encouraging change and improving quality;
- some realistic assessment of what campuses can actually contribute, rather than claim to contribute, to ameliorating community problems.

FRED F. HARCLEROAD

Just this year, a report was submitted to the President entitled Toward a Public Policy for Graduate Education in the Sciences. I would like to quote from it.

> Encouragement should be given to the development of multi-disciplinary graduate programs at both the master's and doctoral level adapted to the problems of a changing society, combining various of the natural, social and engineering sciences, and, when appropriate, leading to the award of new types of advanced professional degrees designed for the preparation of practitioners rather than research-oriented specialists.

So there you have the same recommendation from the prestigious Carnegie Commission as from a task force reporting officially to the President.

In the future it will be possible to pay for this and to have alternative plans available because there will be enormous numbers of Ph.D.'s—or doctorates replacing the Ph.D.—produced in the next 30 to 40 years. It's estimated that we will have to produce as many as 80,000 doctorates within the next 30 years.

At the present time, 36 different degrees are rather widely used throughout the country. The prestige institutions of the United States are not afraid to initiate multiple doctorates. Harvard started multiple doctorates in 1872. The Doctor of Science was set up for science degrees and the Ph.D. was set up for degrees in the humanities and the social sciences.

I would suggest that you not worry about prestige in thinking about this new degree. Your faculties probably will worry, but you should hope that they might be venturesome and willing to try something new. They would be preparing interested undergraduate teachers for the students who are going to continue to overwhelm us in the years to come.

JACK HARRISON

All forecasts of the future suffer from the same assumption. They assume that life on this planet will survive long enough for the future to arrive. Many forecasts suffer a second assumption—that our society will be a humane society when the future arrives. The ground under these assumptions is increasingly turning into quicksand.

Most institutions of higher education look upon studies of the future as fantastic flights of imagination, at least, or, at most, as extra-institutional or certainly extracurricular activities. If we are to survive as a humane society, we will have to learn how to educate ourselves to deal with the big questions and we will have to do so very soon. There are no more crucial questions than the uses of knowledge in war, health, poverty, population, food production, racism and privacy.

The study of the future encompasses all of the moral issues. My thesis is that the study of the future, therefore, should become central to the curriculum and that issue-oriented education rather than an academic, minuet-oriented education is the name of the game. The study of the future will require the most imaginative, massive reorganization of our institutions of learning. We need to involve the public in these discussions, along with students, administrators and faculty.

It has been suggested that after 800 years of history, higher education is still full of amateurs seeking to educate persons to be humane. If a college or university acted upon the concept that we are amateurs and provided the means for students and teachers to embark on a quest for the future together, the results would be just short of miraculous.

My thesis is that the study of the future should be the central curriculum, with all else servant to it. To do this requires an immediate, massive reorganization of structures and methods of present institutions of higher education.

You now have the class of 1973 in your institutions. Only three years after that, in 1976, we will celebrate the two hundredth birthday of this nation. Meantime, we live in a society whose systems of operation and education still perpetuate racism while keeping the white middle class in power, still support aggression abroad while making conservative responses to the problems of domestic tranquility. These attitudes and characteristics have their guidance system locked in a World War I launching pad. So far, our attempts to move this vehicle off its target have not been very effective.

In a television broadcast made just before he retired, Chief Justice Earl Warren said he had grave doubts that the Bill of Rights could be ratified today as amendments to the Constitution.

When we succeed in placing higher education behind barbed wire, the process will be complete. At that point the whole society will no longer be free. Radicals on the left and radicals on the right will all be in jail or dead, because radicals always act like free men whether right or left. And the silent majority will remain silent.

The awful tidal wave of the present looks as if it will crest by 1976; our hope is in the peculiarities of the revolutionary age in which we live. We are now approaching the crossroads, with options to choose. Unlike the churches, which have lost the young people, and a society which can only deal with them by police methods, you still have the young. They are among you and with you, eager to press forward to the future. Join them. It'll be worth the candle.

To translate this into old testament terms, this is like standing on Black Saturday between Good Friday and Easter, with no guarantee that Easter will come. But if it ever does, O Lord, what a morning!

WATTS HILL, JR.

If you find most of my points critical, let me say that they are made, in a paraphrase of John Gardner, as a loving critic or as a critical lover.

The basic premise I ask you to consider is this: We have failed at all levels – Federal, state, local and institutional – to manage higher education adequately. I believe that we have failed and in this failure have contributed to our increasingly precarious position. The general public, lawmakers and those who provide our financial support at every level have lost confidence in higher education.

To say that society as a whole has failed to manage itself adequately and, by so doing, has added to the crisis in higher education does not absolve us from blame. We've added to society's problems by our failure to manage ourselves adequately.

We have operated rather than managed. And there is a big difference. I wonder how many of us even remember the difference. Do we remember when, as undergraduates, we were taught that the management process consisted of planning, organizing, administering and controlling? The definitions of those four elements in the management process are oversimplified. They are used to remind us of what the management process should be versus what it is too often misunderstood to be – that is, operating from day to day.

Most institutions simply operate, with major elements in the management process conspicuous by their absence. Most institutions lack a meaningful statement of mission and long-range plans. And no one can manage effectively without specific institutional objectives.

In the absence of meaningful plans and objectives, what is there to administer? As opposed to audit, constructive control is impossible in the absence of plans and performance objectives.

The same situation exists with government and governmental agencies at the state and Federal level. Until agreement is reached on a few basic principles, I see no end to what has become a vicious circle. These principles should include sublimating the individual aspirations of institutions to continuing national and statewide goals such as equal access to post-high school education for all with the ability and motivation to benefit.

Two other principles would be good management at all levels, from Washington down to departments within institutions, and accepting outside coordination as desirable. Coordination will continue to be necessary in the future as it has been in the past. The real question is not whether we will be coordinated, but what will be subject to coordination, at what level, and by whom.

The best way to preserve institutional autonomy in those areas in which an institution wants to be autonomous – course content, for example – is to stop fighting for autonomy where it really has never existed – in setting an institution's role and scope, for example.

My final principle would be recognizing that the status of an institution is not an end in itself. Each institution is part of a whole and part of a state system which, in turn, is part of a national system. Any institution is only the means to an end. The same is true for any system of higher education, state or national.

The only legitimate end for higher education is serving the needs of society by educating the citizenry through the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. If one of these principles is paramount as the sine qua non for recognizing the importance of all others, it is that the institution is a means to an end and not an end in itself.

18

My call, then, is for applying the management process to post-high school education. We must plan, organize, administer and control instead of operating aimlessly to mollify vested interests and satisfy institutional aspirations. Today we all share guilt for our failure to manage adequately. Ideally, we should begin by establishing national goals and performance objectives which would be translated into statewide goals and performance objectives and then into institutional goals and performance objectives. This would produce a coordinated system with coordinated statements of the mission and plan of each institution. Then, and only then, will we be permitted the requisite freedom to carry out what are widely accepted and jointly developed plans.

STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE 70's

E. ALDEN DUNHAM
FRED F. HARCLEROAD

15 (no p.16)   20

"COLLEGES OF THE FORGOTTEN AMERICANS" - A PROFILE OF STATE COLLEGES AND REGIONAL UNIVERSITIES

E. ALDEN DUNHAM

One of the projects of the Carnegie Commission was to put together a series of profiles of all the segments of American higher education in the hope of presenting a kind of map of higher education. Each of these profiles, which cover everything from Catholic colleges, black colleges, research universities, liberal arts colleges, state colleges, and community colleges, was done by a separate author. They were to describe the institutions involved–what makes them unique, what their aspirations are. The people doing these profiles were to visit these institutions, to try to get a feeling for what goes on at the campuses and see what they actually look like. I've tried to put all of this into the profile I wrote, which is being published by McGraw-Hill. It's called Colleges of the Forgotten Americans and I hope it is a reasonably accurate description of state colleges and universities.

I am extremely grateful for the help that Allan Ostar provided at the outset and Fred Harcleroad gave lots of good advice. I want to thank all of the administrators, faculty members and students with whom I was fortunate enough to spend some time a year ago in the spring of 1968, as I went around visiting some 15 institutions.

I want to stress that the material in this book is my own responsibility and does not reflect Clark Kerr or the Commission. It may be that as part of the series the Carnegie Commission will put together reports of their own, reflecting what appears in the individual profiles, but each author is responsible for his own document.

Let me give you a quick synopsis of the book. There are ten chapters, followed by David Riesman's commentary at the end. The first chapter is entitled, "To Frame the Target, Three Studies." What impressed me from the start was the clear spectrum along which AASCU member institutions were moving in their development from single-purpose teacher preparation institutions all the way up to–or even over–multi-purpose universities.

In order to give something of the impression of the spectrum, the first chapter attempts to describe three institutions at different points in the range. On the far left there is a place which is wrestling with its name–Kansas State Teachers College in Emporia. As far as I know, this is almost the only four-year state college in the United States with the name "Teachers" still within its title. An institution in the middle which has progressed an amazing distance in a very few years is the State University College at Brockport, New York. Then, finally, as an example of an institution which has developed quite far, there is Western Michigan University.

The purpose of setting up the spectrum and of the three individual studies was to set the stage for the discussion of particular issues which comes in later chapters.

The second chapter, "Some History and Numbers," goes into the history of AASCU institutions–enrollment, growth, production of teachers, and so forth. It seems quite clear to me, by the way, that there is not the shortage of teachers that some people still talk about.

The next chapter is entitled, "Educational Pressures, Internal and External." It has to do with what is occurring as these institutions take on greater responsibilities. There is a change from softness to hardness, from essentially single-purpose teacher training institutions enrolling many more women than men to multi-purpose institutions enrolling more men than women. More of the hard sciences are coming in and a much more competitive atmosphere seems to prevail as these institutions take on added responsibilities.

The point which becomes quite clear at some of these institutions which have moved very far is that enrollment growth becomes the key to the transformation of the single-purpose teacher training institution to multi-purpose status. Attempts to transform institutions from single-purpose to multi-purpose status without enrollment growth seems to me very difficult, if not impossible.

The second half of the chapter has to do with the external pressures, mainly the advent in recent years of state systems, master plans and so on. Here I go into explicit situations in California, where a real problem exists at the present time and where the master plan is very much under attack and may well give way at any time. Indeed, in California the state colleges stand at the center of the problem. New York, New Jersey and North Carolina are other explicit instances with which I deal.

Chapter four has the title, "The Financing of State Colleges, Broadway Theatre and Gourmet Restaurants." Essentially, what we're getting at is the problem of productivity in higher education. Through the Carnegie Commission, we were able to put together a lot of financial statistics which have not been put together before for state colleges or, indeed, for any other group of institutions.

Chapter five is entitled, "One End of the Log, Students." Here I try to describe what students are like in these institutions. Sub-heads within this title talk about traditional culture. Here is where the title of the book comes, Colleges of the Forgotten Americans. It really should read at this point, Colleges of the Silent Majority, following President Nixon's change of terms a couple of weeks ago. In the campaign he had been talking about the forgotten Americans, which was the title I used.

In short, first generation collegians, the sons and daughters of lower middle class whites, are generally more conservative than students at many of the colleges which have experienced activism and protest.

A subhead, however, is called "Changing Values." It points out that changes are, indeed, taking place in the student culture found at state colleges around the country, particularly at state college campuses in metropolitan areas.

Another subhead is "Athletic Problems." I enjoyed talking to many athletes and to administrators about the problems of athletes. It's interesting to see how the football team, once the college president's bane, is now pretty much his ally. It is a part of the establishment, opposing activist students like those at San Francisco State, for example, who captured the student activity fund and refused to support the football team.

Under a final subhead, "Academic Talent," I talk about the ACE norm studies and how they relate to state college students. Finally, I deal with results of various tests of campus atmosphere and try to describe how students feel about particular campuses.

One of the main points in this chapter is that, within the state colleges, there has traditionally been a separation of the student's academic and personal life. Students didn't care about this as long as they got their certificates and job security lay ahead. They could lead the lives they wanted to lead. The academic side was one thing, but it didn't intertwine. It seems to me that what's happening now on state college campuses, and on campuses in general, is that the students are trying to bring their personal lives and their academic lives together.

Chapter six, "The Other End, the Faculty," deals with state college faculties and describes some of the tensions that are introduced as more liberal arts specialists and Ph.D.'s are brought into the campus. It talks about the faculty's ambitions, their motivations for change in status from college to university, the impact of research and graduate programs, and what happens to the older, teacher-education faculty members in such a situation.

We have an interesting profile of AASCU faculty members—how many there are and in what kinds of areas, their degrees and salaries.

Chapter seven is "What Shall be Taught?" The first section deals with what isn't taught, notes that there are very few law and medical schools, and very few doctorate programs as a proportion of the total doctorate programs within the United States. Actually, just over one per cent of all doctorates in the United States come from AASCU institutions and 69 per cent of that one per cent is in education.

I tried to look into teacher education as I went around. I was rather saddened to find that, with some exceptions, teacher education programs have perhaps been the least responsive to change.

I tried to analyze the transfer problem—the problem of what happens to the community college students who come in. In higher education, this isn't limited to four-year AASCU institutions. Everyone accepts the sanctity of the four-year experience and assume that all the programs must be organized from the freshman year to the senior year. Yet in many of these institutions the freshman class has very little in common with the senior class. Fifty per cent or more of those who graduate have transferred in at some time. It strikes me that one of the major problems facing these, and other four-year institutions, is their relationship with community colleges.

One of my more radical suggestions is that AASCU institutions, together with AAJC and the community colleges, as the fastest-growing segment of higher education ought to be doing much more together. My recommendation is, for example, that your annual meeting might profitably be held in conjunction with AAJC.

There are exciting things going on in curriculum reform. Let me suggest one line of thought which seems to me important. You may disagree. I take my cue from Kenneth Kenniston at Yale, who's looked hard at student activism both at home and abroad.

We stand at a point in time when two major revolutions are occurring simultaneously. We have, on the one hand, the dying volcanic eruption of the industrial revolution with all of its values, its promise of affluence and power for all. This is exemplified by the activism of black students and of the black population in general. They want to be in on the action. We've had a spreading down of power, affluence, money and material goods from the aristocracy to the middle class and now, finally, to the lower classes in the United States. A lot of black protest has to do with the traditional American dream, which is basically quantitative in essence and with the industrial revolution and what it portends.

We have, on the other hand, particularly with white affluent students, the incipient start of a new revolution—the post-industrial revolution, which is essentially a qualitative revolution. A new set of values is being born and distilled. It's quite clear to me that we stand at a point in time of cultural divide.

What meaning does this have for the curriculum. I think it means, particularly with respect to our general education programs, that our faculties ought to think hard about what the modern activist student generation is really all about, and the kinds of values it's trying to find. The future is going to be radically different from the past, and our colleges must help young people answer the crucial value problems they face.

The eighth chapter, entitled "The Urban Crisis," has to do with what's going on in cities. When black students rebelled at Harvard, white students joined them to fight the administration. I suspect that the problem at state colleges is different. When the black students rebel, they fight the white students or the white students fight them, not necessarily the administration. There is an oil and water mix of lower middle class white students wanting to preserve status and black students wanting to achieve theirs. This makes the problem on state college campuses all the more difficult. The challenge is greater. I would hope that challenge can be met.

Instead of talking about the doubling of average enrollment of state college campuses around the country—and the prediction is from 4,500 to about 10,000 by 1975—we ought to talk more about the creation of new campuses in urban centers.

Chapter nine is entitled "Seven Years Later, Alumni," and reports much new data compiled from questionnaires sent to state college alumni of the class of 1961. The results are discouraging with respect to what these alumni think their education did for them.

The next time that survey is taken some seven years hence, the results will hopefully be quite different, as these institutions move along. They're certainly not the same today as they were seven years ago. On the other hand, the danger is that they will not develop the uniqueness, the diversity, the pluralism for which we hope. The danger is that they will follow in the weary footsteps of prestige institutions, where most of today's problems are found. For this reason, I endorse a different kind of degree, and college teachers who are devoted to their institutions, to innovations, to change, to teaching.

The primary task facing the state colleges is this identity crisis. Just where are they headed? Generally speaking, I agree that they are teaching institutions aimed at meeting regional needs. But the system tends to defeat this goal as long as we load these colleges down with

Ph.D.'s who are inevitably drawn into the traditional orbit. New kinds of institutions are needed, and for that, new kinds of faculty members are needed.

Emerging AASCU colleges seem to me to be full of vitality and enthusiasm, but they need bold imagination and the self confidence to strike out in new and uncharted ways. They need diversity. Each college should aim at a uniqueness, some kind of distinct personality. Too many seem as though they've been made from the same cookie cutter, which is a matter of identity, of models.

Enough has happened in the last year or so to convince even the most conservative educator that we don't know the answers to education. Currently in a state of flux, state colleges can do one of two things. They can either strike off in new directions or they can follow in the well-trodden footsteps of today's most troubled institutions. The choice should not be difficult.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, CURRENT STATUS AND FUTURE PLANS OF THE DEVELOPING STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

FRED F. HARCLEROAD

Some of you have read Frederick Rudolph's history of higher education in America. He worked on this for two years, with the support of the Social Science Research Council. If you will take a careful look at his bibliographical entries, you will find that they go for page after page, and nowhere is there a reference to AASCU institutions. It is a sad and interesting fact that one of the best extant histories of American higher education contains no mention of these institutions.

That was my challenge. To date I have collected about 75 histories of these colleges. A number of them came from microfilm or from dissertations, but there are enough published to document the fact that these institutions exist and have made a special and considerable contribution to American development in the last 130 years.

My study set out to fill a gap, and about 200 of you helped when you filled out a questionnaire. Then the U.S. Office of Education became concerned that the supply of teachers might dry up throughout the United States if the former teachers' colleges became multi-purpose institutions and diverted the potential supply of teachers into other major fields. We worked out a very modest OE contract which paid for about a fourth of the study.

First we tried to ascertain if enough teachers were graduating from AASCU-type colleges and universities to help supply the elementary, secondary and junior colleges of the United States.

It is not at all certain that the junior colleges want these graduates any more. They would prefer to have people who are educated to be teachers at the college, rather than secondary level. And the supply of teachers for the elementary and secondary schools is going up. The 1967 AACTE productivity report indicates that 46 per cent of the teachers produced in the United States came from the institutions represented in this Association.

This figure is an increase from the 42 or 43 per cent of the early 1950's.

So the supply is not just staying the same. It's going up a little bit proportionately, even as the number of teachers has gone up and as the number of students has gone up.

But my initial purpose had not been to find out about teacher productivity. My concern and interest centered on the origins of these institutions, what they have done lately and what they are likely to do in the years to come.

We did find definite historical periods–the normal school period, the teachers college period. We also found today there are clear modal patterns of four different types of AASCU institutions. Of the 284 institutions, we classified about 30 institutions as teachers colleges–only about ten per cent. This rough designation developed from the proportion of their graduates going into teaching.

Alongside the teachers colleges there are about a dozen specialized institutions, including the Maine Maritime Academy and the Massachusetts College of Art.

The modern state college, the third kind, is the modal institution of the whole group. There are probably 170 to 185 of them. Finally, there are about 25 institutions which we have called regional state universities. These are the institutions offering advanced work beyond the master's degree.

There are some 90 institutions now called universities, but we didn't classify them as such because they are not yet offering advanced doctoral studies beyond the master's degree.

Within these different institutions, many diverse organizational patterns have been developed and there have been dramatic increases in curricular offerings. The most striking, large scale expansions are at the master's degree level and in degree programs offered in the arts and sciences. For the future, up through 1973-74, this should be one of the biggest areas of development.

We also see a great extension of course offerings at both the baccalaureate and master's degree level in needed occupational, vocational, semi-professional or professional programs. At the same time, there is an increasing amount of work going on at less than baccalaureate levels in occupational fields.

In examining these institutions and comparing them with all others throughout the country, it became apparent that it might help to have a two-dimensional framework for classification. This moves from classifying the institutions as having basic emphasis at the collegiate undergraduate instructional level on to where the university graduate instruction and research are stressed. That's one dimension.

The second dimension goes from a theoretical orientation to an applied orientation. Now, I've categorically stated that you can be as highly specialized at the theoretical level as you can be at the applied level. The comprehensive institutions, then, are between these two lines.

You have a very specialized undergraduate institution offering only the baccalaureate degree with the Maritime Academy as a good example. St. John's College would be a good example of a highly specialized theoretically-oriented baccalaureate degree institution–just as specialized as the Maritime Academy.

Then you have the very specialized theoretically-oriented doctoral institution like MIT which has three times as many graduate students as it does undergraduate.

The Federal-grant university with a national or even an international orientation is essentially moving from being highly specialized at the theoretical level into the comprehensive type institution. The same is true for the developing regional state universities. We tried to differentiate between the Federal national institution and the regional one because the emphasis differs, depending on each institution's basic source of funds and to whom each was responsible.

As your institutions grow in the next decade in faculty and numbers of students, and in diversification of curricula, you will be faced with an identity crisis. You ought to take a realistic look at the region you serve, determine what its needs are and how your institutions can meet them. Then go ahead and do the best possible job of it. Don't be frustrated because you can't be the same type as the Federal grant universities. We've got between 50 and 60 of them right now. Even with increasing funds, even with the Kerr Commission talking about putting one-seventh of the additional productivity of the United States into higher education in the next 10 to 20 years, it won't pay for more than another 25 of these institutions. So I recommend that you disabuse your faculty of vain and pointless ambition and say, "Let's stay with our own work and do a first-rate job of it."

THE BLACK STUDENT OF THE 70's

HERMAN R. BRANSON
GWEN PATTON
ERNEST D. MASON
WILLIAM B. BOYD

28 24 (no p.25+26)

HERMAN R. BRANSON

The feeling I have about discussing the question of the black student of the 70's is that all of us really know what needs to be done. The question is, however, do we have the intestinal fortitude to do it?

Let us review briefly some of the problems which confront us and the things we must do in the next decade to achieve the type of society we want. Too often it seems as though our social system is being run upon principles which are 17th, 18th and, at the very latest, 19th century understanding, and yet the happenings of the last 30 years should have revolutionized our society.

In the first instance, you may well know that less than one hundred years ago Louis Agassiz could have the most outlandish ideas about men and about race, and yet be America's leading scientist of the day. In 1969 his ideas are no longer intellectually respectable. There are a few governors who have odd ideas, but for the most part, anyone who is acquainted with these notions knows that things have changed profoundly.

The evidence from social anthropology, cultural anthropology, biochemical genetics is that the physiognomic differences among men are essentially superficial. Our molecules are exactly the same. There are no incompatibilities. We all start off or we'll end up at about the age of six or seven with about ten-billion neurons in our head. This is what we have to work with.

The most isolated people, the Australian aborigines, who were cut off for roughly twenty thousand years, have met and have mated very enthusiastically with Scots from the Outer Hebrides, and nothing ever happened.

In short, one great factor for change today is that a better intellectual machinery exists for self-understanding than ever before in history.

There is a second factor for change. In the past it has seemed that the world was a place of extremely limited resources and every nation must seize and closely guard its share. The supply of fossil fuels—coal, oil—couldn't last indefinitely. It certainly looked bad for man's future.

But 30 years ago a discovery was made that gives us the physical resources to bring the advantages of civilization to all the people of this earth.

Now, of course, we may not make it if we allow our population to increase at its present rate but we know that the physical resources exist to make this spaceship earth a wonderful place in which to live. The question is how do we go about doing it?

One of the major things we in America must do is think about and plan for the group which is the subject of this symposium—the black student in the 70's. We must brush aside all the meretricious things which have been affecting our thinking and our behavior. And if you were to ask me for just one word to summarize the solution it would be a good four-letter word—the word more. The major concern in the 70's must be for all our American colleges and universities to bring the number of black students who enter and—much more important—who graduate at least up to a level commensurate with the black population ratio.

I don't say merely to enter, because in too many instances we have found that the open door is a revolving door. It is a tragic thing when these black students stay in an institution only long enough to have their pictures taken and are out before Thanksgiving. We must work to ensure that the blacks who are brought into American higher education stay in and graduate.

Let me cite an impressive statistic at this point. As late as 1968, roughly 80 per cent of all the blacks in America who received bachelor's degrees got them from predominantly black schools, this in spite of the fact that roughly half of the blacks in college were then in predominantly white institutions.

Our path through the 70's is very clear. We've got to bring these young people in; we've got to keep them and we must, of course, give them a true and honest education.

That last point is one which we cannot escape. You may be unaware of it, but some chilling things are being done on the secondary school level. You may not have heard there is something called a general diploma. I hope you haven't heard of it. It's used in places like New York and Philadelphia where blacks are taken into the secondary schools, but they're put in something called a general curriculum, which essentially says, "If you keep quiet and don't cause too much trouble, we'll graduate you at the same time as your class."

These young people have had six or seven semesters of choral music and all sorts of things which, though interesting, leave them totally unprepared to go to college anywhere in the United States. This is the type of thing we must battle.

Now at the college and university level we don't do that. Or do we? The percentage of blacks in college is not too bad. It should be 10 or 12 per cent, and it's perhaps now about four per cent. But when you look at the professions, you find it's much less—perhaps two or one per cent.

Look, for example, at the whole problem of America's needs in medicine. The folklore was that we had a large number of black physicians. And yet some of us who have banded together and are working on a program for 1,000 more blacks in medicine per year found that of the 300,677 physicians in the United States, fewer than 5,000 are black.

It's not only medicine; it's dentistry and engineering; it's law, it's all professions. Oh, yes, the black student has suffered. He has been put into certain rather limited curricula even in predominantly black schools, and the assumption has been that this is correct for him. This is the thing which we must battle.

Blacks can make a great contribution to the professions. It is clear that peoples all over the world have contributed profoundly to knowledge and culture. You and I are the inheritors of the Greco-Roman tradition, and we can sit back and say, "Well, of course, they were all white." But you find that this tradition rested upon the discoveries of some people who were not white—the ancient Egyptians, for instance, who originated much of Greek culture.

And so we're not on sand; we're on a firm foundation when we talk about bringing the black students into the professions.

Now, what are the dimensions of our problem if we accept the fact that our primary responsibility is to expand professional opportunity for the blacks? And observe, I am not really worried about the fact that some of these young blacks are awfully angry. I expect that. It's justified. I think any young person who reads our wonderful words and then looks at our obnoxious actions has a right to be fed up and a bit outrageous in his behavior.

But remember that in spite of this that we are dealing with young people of essential good will who are only asking that we implement our high ideals and prove we believe in these things and we are going to work toward them.

Having laid that foundation, let's look at what the problems will be. Well-meaning friends—and they are friends really, even though their actions don't coincide with their protestations—are going to say, "Oh, yes, we'll be delighted to take all the students who are qualified." What they are really saying is that American higher education has the standards of a middle class society and will take all the black students who, in spite of their backgrounds, show up with all these good qualities.

Remember, that's impossible. The young people who are going to graduate from college in the 1970's are anywhere from 10 to 15 years old now. Their essential characters have been set. The youngsters who will be the college students of the 1970's are already running around in the streets. Their habits are being formed, and if we are talking about getting them into college and giving them educational opportunity, we will need a profoundly different attitude on the basis of which we can deal with them.

Of course, every now and then a young persom comes along from an unlikely environment who just knocks your eyes out. Exactly a hundred years ago, George Washington Henderson, a black who was born into slavery graduated from the University of Vermont. To add icing to the cake, he was a Phi Betta Kappa. But the fantastic thing was that at the age of 14—twelve years before he graduated from college—he was completely illiterate.

Again a hundred years ago, a black woman by the name of Arias Stuart finished at the top of the New York Medical School's 1870 graduating class.

We ought to accept as fact that these young blacks with unfortunate backgrounds—the ones running around on the streets that we've been talking about—can be brought up to respectable levels of competence in all professional fields. We've got to be serious about it, modify our teaching approaches and individualize instruction.

I believe, therefore, that after achieving our first objective, which is a far greater enrollment of blacks in the colleges, we must aim for a second goal—the goal of accountability. Colleges must feel themselves accountable for retaining and successfully educating these students.

Up to this point, we've been operating on the Woodrow Wilson principle. A mother came to Mr. Wilson, at that time president of Princeton. She was worried about her son. Wilson answered her, "Madame, do not despair. We guarantee satisfaction or we return the child."

We don't want that. We want it to be the other way around, that every youngster who comes to us is a challenge. Our concern should be, to take John Jones who has been ill-used and ill-prepared and give him an opportunity to grow and to develop. How can we teach him the intellectual skills, the habits of thought, the values which are essential for a person who is working and performing in the modern age?

This, then, is the question and the problem. When we have integrated this concept into the American educational philosophy, we will have gone a long way toward realizing our goals. The blemish on American higher education right now is that of the blacks we take in we graduate only between 30 and 40 per cent—and predominantly black colleges' records are as bad as the others.

We have demonstrated that the black student can be retained. The Institute for Services to Education ran a great experimental program on 13 campuses which took in 1,250 black students and kept practically all of them through the freshman year. It was able to do this because it was a good program, one with content and concern. And the students were open; they thought, they read, they did all the things which we were trying to get them to do. So we know how to achieve our aim.

Yet at Central State University, my little school, 280 students left at the end of the autumn quarter and didn't come back for the beginning of the winter quarter.

We made a study which drew a response from roughly 40 per cent of them. Of these, 67 per cent said that they did not come back for financial reasons. Further enquiry revealed the fact that we could have kept practically all of them for another $500 apiece, but we didn't have the money.

These students were not on probation. They were not dropped—they quit. They quit because they could not afford to come back.

The 280 students we lost were exactly equal to all the blacks at Harvard, MIT, Brandeis and the main campus of the University of Virginia. What do you think would happen if all the black students at those institutions were to drop out at the end of the semester? There would be quite a stir, would there not?

But the 280 students who left Central State didn't even cause a ripple. Poverty was at the root of it and it was the forgotten man who went down. There is no blaze of publicity on these people, but they are the ones who count. Society needs them—they do the real work.

So you can see that the problem of the black student of the 1970's is a tough one. It's a problem of convincing our faculties, convincing ourselves, that we must agree not only to accept much greater numbers of black students but we must agree also to accept the responsibility of creating conditions that make it possible for the black student to stay his four years in college and, at the end of that time, come into the world of affairs an educated man. We must work on it and we must try valiantly to achieve it.

All else, in my opinion, is secondary. The turmoil now going on, that's secondary. The fact is that some people are using the turmoil to opt out of their social responsibilities; I think that's unfortunate, but it doesn't effect our big responsibility. It is an absolute necessity to bring blacks into American education in numbers commensurate with the population ratio if we are going to achieve social justice in America. There is no other way. And we must give them honest and forthright programs which will enable them to become producing and effective members of twentieth century civilization.

This blueline for education and social justice now rests upon a firm foundation. The intellectual defense of racism is gone. All of the things which blacks have experienced, that arrogant assumption of superiority seen too often on our campuses, can be swept away in the cool, clean light of what we know through science and the social sciences.

But it's not an easy assignment; it is going to take the very best all of us can give. And remember, it's going to be easy enough for us to opt out, very easy indeed. You can always say, "Those kids were obnoxious. I don't know what they expect me to do. They expect me to lower my standards." But the goal to be achieved will be to reach parity by the end of the 70's. Then I think we can be assured that the society of the future will be a healthy one.

GWEN PATTON

My talk is about black students, in particular those who are at the state colleges.

The black student movement in this country started at North Carolina State College in 1961. The students decided they would challenge segregation in public accommodations. That developed into freedom rides, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee was formed. It came into existence because we needed certain kinds of action that would have student flavor and show that students were mature enough to run their own organization and develop programs that would meet the aspirations of younger people.

At this point, many students began to drop out of school to work full time in the student movement. Our intentions were noble, just as our intentions today are noble. We found a lot of reaction not only from local white racists but from black trustee board members in general in our quest to get the United States relevant to its people. When they began to escalate their tactics, the students followed suit. I think there is a steady line of progression from 1961 until 1969, and if you think you've had trouble with my generation, wait until you begin to deal with these five, six and seven year old kids who've been involved in rioting and looting. You're going to have the real thing on your hands in the 1970's.

You're going to have to deal not only with black students but with the growing awareness of white students. The Jerry Rubins' today number maybe a hundred; in the 1970's they'll be coming by the thousands. And you cannot cope with them with police dogs and police clubs, expulsion and things like that because they have gotten to the point where they don't give a damn and are ready to take any kind of consequence and make any kind of sacrifice to develop a meaningful country or meaningful programs for the nation.

I am a woman, and as a woman it seems to me that society describes the role a man plays and the role a woman plays. We have to deal with this because it effects the way men and women behave. Society equates masculinity with being harsh, rigid and stubborn. If you succumb—and that's the term that's used—your masculinity has suffered a blow. That's a false notion, a notion that has been blown way out of proportion.

It means that if you criticize the way a president runs a college, it is the equivalent of an attack upon his person. This is true all over, in the deep South with black colleges, as well as any place else, because we've all been caught up in the same bag of what's appropriate for men and what's appropriate for women.

Let's talk about the people who are on the governing boards, the boards of regents, and the administrators of state colleges. Many of them are unintellectual people. That's point one. They don't care about any kind of philosophy. Uusually they are businessmen who have a very strange kind of mentality because they're only interested in how to make more money.

Now look at the students—intellectuals or trying to become intellectuals; trying to become very rational, using that argument, using that philosophy and logic which can best resolve modern conflicts. When you pit these two groups one against another, you're going to have conflict—it doesn't even have to have black against white. There's absolutely no way to solve some of those problems that occur.

Then you get a further area of conflict in which the regents or the administrators adopt the attitude of parent versus child. When the students come up with an idea, instead of dealing with it the administration takes the attitude of "You're a child. I've had more experience than you." That attitude is the hallmark of a small mentality, extremely unsure of itself. Students react strongly to it and then comes the conflict about who knows more and the issue itself soon vanishes.

Let us also talk about how this country, as far as I'm concerned, uses colleges and universities. I think they are viewed as a dumping ground for surplus labor because if colleges disappeared tomorrow, there wouldn't be enough jobs for all the students, particularly the 375,000 black students, now enrolled in institutions of higher learning. You college presidents and the administrators have allowed this country to make your colleges dumping grounds. You haven't understood the process by which it happened.

You've allowed government to put all kinds of military-industrial complex research centers on the campus and students are no longer free to explore the humanities and philosophies of people.

You've become extremely rigid about the writers we should read. It's got to be Plato and Aristotle, and when the students say they would like to read Marx, Dostoevski, Nietzsche, Mao, and Du Bois you deny us that.

We begin to question why we can't read the whole spectrum, to see what kind of life style appeals to us. Basically, what you do here is no different from what they do in Russia, because they tell the Russians what to read to form their patterns.

You have a preconceived idea of what a student is supposed to think and be after four years of college.

We want to read everything. We want to read Stokely Carmichael. When you don't give us the opportunity you negate the very purpose for which a university exists. It's a denial of the freedom to learn and if you feel that you can't teach about Eldridge Cleaver, then something's wrong with your teaching.

If you believe in your philosophy, your philosophers, and you feel their thought can't outweigh somebody who's teaching the opposite, you're frightened. Perhaps it is because you are afraid the others are saying something that's a little bit more relevant.

You're always saying students don't want to read. Students read all the time. We just don't read what you want us to read because it's not interesting or else your approach to it makes it uninteresting.

Now, let's talk about state colleges in particular because I think most black students on the West Coast and in the urban North go to state colleges because they cost less. I think they should be free for blacks.

Black students have gotten to the point where they do not give a damn about racism and your attitude. They don't care. We went through a period from '61 to '64 trying to get white people to like us. From '65 on up, we don't care anymore. Some whites respect blacks but I don't particularly care about that either.

I'm getting very tired of saying that blacks want a decent education and they're willing to go through anything that's necessary to get one. And it doesn't mean just to learn black facts, like Booker T. Washington founded Tuskegee Institute and all of that. We want to understand the psyche of Booker T. Washington.

We cannot understand what is so inflammatory about a black studies curriculum. We have studied the white experience for four hundred years, and it doesn't seem to be too outstanding; even white folks ought to try to get away from the lily-white experience. People get hung up on fables that are hoary with tradition and teach them as fact. They are unable to recognize and refuse to accept that what they are teaching is the legacy of racism.

"Columbus discovered America." How can he "discover" a country full of Indians? So the facts are not objective facts, you know.

The universities ought to understand that it's to their interest to learn a little bit of the black experience, about the Islam experience, about other experiences.

The question has been raised about New York City and how black students take a general course that teaches them nothing. In Chicago, they have a track system. A student in the sixth grade is placed in a track and he will graduate in that track. There's absolutely no motivation. Most of them know enough to quit school anyway–it's a waste of time.

Some of them are smart enough to turn to a life of crime, the only thing that we, as black people, are allowed to master. You will not let us master anything else. Black people don't even have any illusions or aspirations about being a part of this society.

A teacher tells a black boy he can be the president of the United States. What is that? Impossible! He can be an astronaut. The astronaut we blacks had burned to death. We won't get another one for a long time.

You tell a boy he can be president and he grows up believing it. Then he gets to be 14 and sees what it's all about. And than you say, "I don't understand these Negroes. What's wrong with them?"

You have to learn how to deal with us. You have to learn the psychology of people's minds instead of just saying, "You're doing fine. You've got two cars and a yacht, a small boat, and a big house." That does not matter. Humanism is the important thing.

We young people are trying to put the education system where it's supposed to be.

ERNEST D. MASON

The word society has been mentioned in connection with educational objectives. This is important because education has always had its political and social motives. This is why certain types of knowledge are in the curriculum and certain types of knowledge are withheld. Social and political motives in America have caused both black and white universities deliberately to eliminate the black man from their curriculum.

When the black student talks about his identity, he is, in a large sense, talking about his manhood. He's looking for a positive self image. In light of this I suggest that black studies alone will not give black students a sense of identity.

As long as the black student cannot function as a man in society, as long as he is castrated on all sides by white America, he will never be able to gain a positive self image, no matter how many black history books he reads. This is why I feel there is a deeper need for white America, white students, to read black history books than for blacks to read them.

An individual's identity is largely determined by the way he feels other people look at him. As long as white America knows nothing about the history and achievements of the black man, it will always regard him wrongly. In a sense, education in the black experience is similar to sex education. Unless you put the task of education into the hands of responsible educators, people will end by picking up all sorts of misinformation from some rather shabby sources.

WILLIAM B. BOYD

I can't presume to speak about how black students see the university, but I do have some observations on what we can expect in terms of the relationship between black students and universities in the 70's. My first point is that our grace period has run out on us. A whole school generation of black children have come to realize that "all deliberate speed" meant never in their lifetime. That doctrine and all its derivatives are gone. Those of us in the universities must realize that there is no time left for stalling. The disparity of the percentage of black students actually on our campuses and the percentage that should be there must be done away with immediately. The gap must be closed.

There's been some disagreement as to whether the percentage of blacks on the campus should be the same as, or higher than, the percentage of blacks in the general population and I think of an analog that suggests it might very well be higher. Those of us whose institutions have inadequate libraries, for example, know that if we are ever to make up for past inadequacies we need to spend more than the correct percentage on our libraries.

I think the same is true as we look at our student mixes. The only antidote for disadvantage is advantage. What we must do now is offer advantage; we must do it frankly and openly, not apologetically.

I think one of the greatest barriers we have is that we are longtime establishment liberals. At this particular point, the instincts of liberalism, which for so long have been beautiful, get in the way of doing what justice and good sense dictate. The number of black students on our campuses must be increased to the degree that, by the end of the 70's, it will no longer be an issue worth discussing.

As these students come on the campus in growing numbers and with growing self-consciousness and self-confidence, we can expect them to make more demands and to do it at a higher level of militancy. About that, I would say to my fellow presidents, let's relax. When legitimate demands have been met, there will be no further necessity for militancy. Consequently, the best way to cope with militance is to identify legitimate demands and meet them as rapidly and as graciously as possible.

Sadly, we are unsure of our ability to recognize legitimate demands when we meet them. This is because we are liberals and know ourselves to be well meaning. We therefore find it hard to accept or realize that our institutions are racist. I am not speaking of the axe handle type of racism; I mean the band-aid type of racism, where you make the band-aid pinkish white, call it flesh colored, and then expect it to meet the needs of a whole population. That's the kind of racism that tends to be imbedded in our institutions. It didn't come about through malice but because of the historical circumstance that made them predominantly white.

We're going to need the help of black students and black faculty members to sensitize us so that we can make our institutions more genuinely hospitable to blacks.

I think the most encouraging thing about the current scene is that the black student is in a very real sense articulating demands that the white student, too, feels; a demand that the university be responsive to him, an expectation that he find his needs and interests reflected in the curriculum of the university. When we have made our institutions responsive to the black student, we'll find ourselves giving better treatment and a more liberating education to all our students.

It's been suggested that I say a word about Nairobi College in East Palo Alto. It's brand new, has only a couple of hundred students this year, has almost no money. But it's a good thing. It is not a public institution because public funds are not available on the terms that are needed to educate the black youth in that area.

A friend of mine wrote me recently about the experience of teaching these first 200 students. She was amazed by the expression on their faces. For the first time, she was looking at young black men and women whose faces did not show anger, and that not until it was absent did she realize how pervasive it had been in the distinguished university from which she came.

NEW IDEAS FOR THE 70's

HAROLD B. CROSBY
THOMAS Y. WHITLEY
E. LEE McLEAN
EDGAR MASTERSON
G. THEODORE MITAU
WILLIAM E. DAVIS
ALBERT BROWN

37 (no p.38)

ORGANIZING RESIDENTS COLLEGES FOR INDIVIDUALIZED LEARNING

HAROLD B. CROSBY

The University of West Florida represents a rather unique approach to providing quality education in a time of massive population growth. Concern for the individual student has dominated its planning. The university's organization structure, its instructional programs and even the architecture reflect the philosophy of individualized education.

The physical facilities are a close blend of living and learning areas designed to promote a more personal student-faculty relationship. The university has adopted a modern version of the resident college concept used so successfully by the great British universities for hundreds of years. Each of the three original colleges is, in effect, a small liberal arts college incorporating a wide variety of academic disciplines. The disciplines are not duplicated in the colleges and students are free to take courses in any of the colleges. Thus they have the benefits of living and working in a small college environment and, at the same time, have the total academic resources of a university available to them.

Each college has its own student government, fields its own intramural athletic teams, engages in its own social activities, making the resident college the center of academic and social life.

The university admits only junior, senior and graduate students. It is designed to draw its student body primarily from the graduates of Florida's public junior colleges.

The thousand-acre main campus provides ample room for orderly development under the direction of its resident campus planner. Five additional colleges will be established, each occupying its own village. The rolling, forested campus of the university adjoins U. S. Highway 90 some 10 miles north of Pensacola, and is bounded by the Escambia River, a navigable stream emptying into Escambia Bay within sight of the campus.

A mile-long stretch of Santa Rosa Island provides an auxiliary campus of some 175 acres.

The campus's highest structure is the five-story library, designed to serve the entire university community. Construction for two new college villages is underway between the library and the river. They are built to a human scale, part of our plan to make the place inviting. We have, for example, residence houses scattered among the office, classroom and specialized buildings along the campus mall.

To foster close contact among faculty, students and administrators, buildings are small and suited for varied uses.

Three buildings, of Gulf Coast colonial design, comprise the university's administrative complex. White columns, hipped roofs and broad verandas hint at Pensacola's colonial past.

The instructional program rests heavily upon faculty counseling, and counseling is an integral part of each faculty member's responsibility. Counseling is continuous, and programs of study are tailor-made to fit the needs of each student. Special individual interests are met through the use of directed study and seminar courses.

The laboratories are kept open for student research and study until long after the sun is down. With their own research projects underway, some students appear never to leave the laboratories.

Television techniques are used in many areas of the instructional program at the university.

The five-story library provides some 90,000 square feet of floor space and a collection of about 250,000 volumes. This will grow to approximately 500,000 by 1975. This is already the largest library along a 400-mile arc of this Gulf Coast. Like all our buildings, the library is built of low maintenance, high durability materials.

All campus buildings, except for the science laboratories, are carpeted for comfort and acoustical control, and—remembering we are in Florida—all buildings are air conditioned.

Library holdings are arranged in open stacks for easy access and comfortable chairs and study carrels are always close at hand.

The social center of the college campus is the commons building, and each of our colleges will have its own commons.

The major factor in the university's emphasis on the individual is its unique residence houses which accommodate just 32 students each. Each contains 16 two-person suites and is built in a hollow square with its own private courtyard for sunning, studying or, in some cases, even gardening. Each air conditioned suite has a study, a private bath and a bedroom for two.

We've tried to preserve the natural beauty of the campus tract, and there is a variety of plants and wildlife which makes it an ideal center for nature study, either by foot or by the many streams that are available. Nature trails are utilized by public school groups as well as by university students.

Bayou, river, bay, sound and even open gulf are all easily reached in the university's research vessels. Pensacola's moderate climate and our ready access to water sources are a natural combination for developing a student's interests in marine science, which we emphasize rather heavily.

Already the bayou is being analyzed and studied from its bottom to the waterside trees in the university biological research program. Faculty members and carefully trained students are collecting specimens from Pensacola Bay and adjacent bayous for detailed study back in the laboratory.

Emphasis in the marine sciences is upon the study of Florida's estuarial waters, the vital nurseries of marine life. Even sports and recreation are water-oriented.

The university's auxiliary campus on Santa Rosa Island is an area better known as Pensacola Beach. Our beach campus stretches from the Gulf of Mexico to Santa Rosa Sound and has two miles of white sand beach. It is ideally suited for upcoming recreation programs and is the site for future development of a center for conferences and continuing studies.

On the main campus, tennis courts are in great demand for recreation as well as for intermural and intercollegiate play. Basketball and handball courts are also available along with a sports playing field, archery range and so on.

We believe we have perhaps the only upper division university in the nation with a balanced intercollegiate athletic program.

When our doors opened in 1967, we had 1,318 students; today we number 3,000, growing toward a projected enrollment of 13,000 in 1981.

This, then, is the University of West Florida; a university designed to complete the work that the junior colleges have begun; a university designed to nurture individual achievement, a faculty and a staff who are dedicated to pursuing that objective.

A PREADMISSIONS PROGRAM FOR THE ACADEMICALLY DEFICIENT

THOMAS Y. WHITLEY

The program at Columbus College that I will describe is rather small and experimental. It has no special equipment, no special facilities.

It resulted from and was conceived out of pressure to admit students who need remedial work of one kind or another.

The regents of our university system indicated admission of poorly qualified students was becoming a problem. We proposed a program to determine whether we could have any success with this group.

Now, you'll have to remember that Columbus College admits a student if he has one chance in 20 of completing our freshman year successfully—virtually an open admission policy. This preadmissions program is designed for students who have less than one chance in 20 of completing our freshman year. Students who are rejected for admission are offered an opportunity to come in and talk with a counselor. If the counselor feels the student has sufficient potential, he recommends that the student be admitted to this special program.

The program is designed to last three quarters—one academic year. Each student has one counselor and three instructors, with instruction pitched at the individual student's performance level. The student is allowed to move to a credit program or to move directly into admission as a regular college student at the end of any one of the three quarters. Or he may be asked to withdraw or may be dropped at the end of any one of the three quarters, or may be allowed to enroll in one or more credit courses while continuing in the other courses.

At the end of the year, those not recommended for admission are helped to choose some other objective for which college attendance is not required.

Students admitted to the program enjoy the same privileges as other students. They're accepted on the campus and allowed to participate freely in student activities. We have even been able to persuade the Veteran's Administration to pay them veterans' benefits.

Of the 96 students admitted in 1967, 58 completed the year, and 32 still continue. Most of these 32 are in their third year. This is practically a one-third success.

These were students who, statistically speaking, had no chance of completing three years of college.

These are the things that we think make this program, to some extent, a success.

Courses in this program are specifically designed. They are not watered-down freshman college classes. The faculty is specially committed, and I believe this is, to a large extent, the secret. Instruction is individualized. Each student's progress is discussed each week by those who are concerned. In other words, a weekly evaluation is made of each student's progress.

Each student is required to attend one or more weekly tutorial sessions in each one of the three courses in which he's scheduled. The tutors are students and we pay them, for the most part, $2 per hour.

When a student seems to lack interest or is making insufficient progress, he can be dropped at any time, upon the recommendation of his instructors.

We would like to expand this program; we believe that it is a success. We feel that the students who are admitted to this program and come through it into full admission in Columbus College actually have a better chance of success than those at the lower end of the spectrum who are admitted through regular channels and who begin as full-fledged college students.

We would like to further reduce the student-teacher ratio from 20 to 25 students per instructor to 12 to 15, and we would like to have a full time director.

The coordinator for testing and guidance for our state university system looked at this program rather closely. He helped a three-college consortium apply for a Federal grant funding a similar program which has now completed its first year successfully.

NEW SOURCES OF PRIVATE SUPPORT FOR THE 70's

E. LEE McLEAN

Ten years ago, perhaps even five years ago, no meeting of public university people would have discussed attracting private money to a public university. Up until the period of World War II we had private universities and public universities, and never the twain shall meet. The public universities had almost no private support and the private universities had almost no public support.

Now that situation has turned around and the private institutions get a great deal of public support from Washington. Last year, in fact, private institutions, across the board, received a couple of percentage points higher of their operating budgets from Federal sources than did the public institutions. And, as we all know, many public institutions have been, for some years, seeking private money.

When public universities went into the field of raising private money, some of the private institutions were deeply concerned. They had considered the gift dollar their primary province.

The thought was that there was a sort of national money barrel, and that what one school removed from this money barrel reduced the amount available to the others. Over the last decade, however, events clearly have proven that this is not only unfounded theory but that the exact opposite occurs.

It's now almost an axiom that the seeking of private funds by one institution benefits all institutions because it awakens prospective donors, generally, to the needs of higher education. Most private institutions, today, no longer fear public institutions seeking gifts.

It should be recognized that higher education has only scratched the surface in attracting private support. Our problem is not that we compete with each other for the gift dollar but, rather, that we must awaken the interest and support of foundations, corporations and individuals.

Corporations, which are allowed to deduct five per cent of their taxable income for gifts, last year gave only 1.1 per cent. Individuals, could have given 30 per cent, and yet collectively they gave only 3.5 per cent.

It is an interesting fact that Americans spend more for cocktails, for haircuts, for color television sets, and even for reducing fads than they do for all of higher education.

The reason for this sad state of affairs rests not with the prospective donor but with the colleges and universities who simply don't do a good enough job of asking for support. I pose this question: How many times in the past year were you involved in a face-to-face solicitation, articulating the needs of your institution to people who could help?

One of our problems has been that we all go to the few foundations, the few individuals who are noted for generosity. We neglect many, who, if their interest were whetted, would become major contributors to higher education. That's the real challenge.

Every president dreams about the dear little lady in tennis shoes who wanders in off the street and says, "Oh, Mr. President, please, may I give you a million dollars?" Well, it just doesn't happen that way, at least not very often. In terms of reality, somebody has to be asked for something directly along the lines of their interest.

The most common mistake in fund-raising is to make the simple decision, "We need money. Therefore, let's go out and tell our constituencies and they'll contribute." In mailings or even in face-to-face contacts the plea emerges, "We need money." Then we sit back and wait for the money to come rolling in. We wonder why the mail isn't filled with checks. This is about as effective as waiting for the little old lady.

In point of fact, money is raised only after the most arduous efforts. A former university president recounts of telling his wife about receiving a million-dollar gift and her answer was, "Well, that figures out to about a dollar an hour for your time." And sometimes it seems that way about the effort and agony involved in soliciting gifts.

It takes a great deal of work to get gifts, long hours of friend-raising followed by intensive fund-raising. Techniques must be employed. Never simply ask for a gift. Instead, match a prospective donor's interests with a particular need of the institution. Say, "We have this exciting, dynamic program in an area directly in line with your particular interests. We'll be a better institution if we can have this program. If we get private support, we can conduct this program, and if we don't, we simply cannot have it."

This is not a sure-fire formula—clearly there is no such thing. But it is as close to it as we can come.

There are some special techniques that help. Never ask a man point blank to put up a building on your campus. But when you get to the point where you think he may be interested have a model made and put his name on it. Make it attractive—lights that go off and on, push a button and the stage turns if it's an auditorium or other creative plan—and then simply put the model on his living room table. If "Jones Hall" sits there a while, his friends are going to start saying, "Have they built that building with your name on it yet?"

This is another effective technique: When you're asking for regular support, show the prospective donor what his dollar will do within the institution.

In the 50 years in which American universities have been raising private money, some methods have proven more effective than others, and we can learn a great deal from these years of trial and error.

Most of all, it takes a missionary spirit, a zeal, an enthusiam. I like to tell a story about a standard New England village and the greatest excitement that town ever had was when the church caught on fire. All the townspeople gathered and someone said to the town patriarch "Why, Zeke, this is the first time I've ever seen you at church." And Zeke's answer is important for all of us. He said, "It's the first time the church has ever been on fire."

Well, that's how it has to be with your institution. It has to be on fire with enthusiasm. The top administration has to communicate this missionary zeal to people whose gifts can help your institution.

At the University of California, we developed a margin of excellence program, based on the thought that a gift dollar to a public institution was the difference between a good institution and a great institution. State legislatures can provide the basics but no state, regardless of its affluence, can provide all the things an institution needs. Thus the role for private gifts is clear and distinct.

But let me say that if you decide to go into this field, do it right. It isn't enough to hire the president of last year's student body and say, "You're now director of development. Go raise money." Though I'm oversimplifying, some institutions have done just about that.

There is the necessity for commitment and involvement on the highest institutional levels.

In this business of seeking private support the barrier to be overcome is apathy and indifference among prospective donors. Great progress has been made and yet much remains to be done. The challenge ahead helps make higher education a wonderfully exciting field in which to work.

MOBILIZING ALUMNI SUPPORT FOR THE 70's

EDGAR MASTERSON

Essentially, my talk focuses upon a rather old idea. It is the simple notion that the first public an institution should identify and cultivate is its alumni.

Using as a basis the membership of this Association, I have done a study of the role of the alumni in development of colleges and universities.

Time does not permit detailed reporting of the mass data gathered in this study, but I can give you the gist of its conclusions and recommendations.

First, there is an alumnus identity which can be regarded as a fixed factor for planning and utilization. It is a logical assumption that a person has a lifelong relationship with his institution of higher education.

Second, I found that five conditions influence the development of alumni programs. They are as follows:

- the age of the institution
- the number of graduates
- the age of the alumni association
- the scope of professional programs offered
- the location of the main campus relative to the nearest population center.

Third, the role of the alumni and the alumni association in the future development of the institution is closely tied to 12 success indicators.

These indicators constitute a working blueprint for the future. All of them can be implemented, refined, supplemented and given unique adaptations for use on a particular campus. They are:

- a full time director of alumni affairs
- a variety of non-economic services and involvements with the institution
- non-financial activities for members of the alumni association
- a direct and regular communication by publication and other means between the institution and the alumni
- effective activities and programs in area chapters or clubs
- graduates and former students serving the institution in many ways, both individually and as representatives of the alumni association
- a president of the university or college with a real commitment to alumni and the alumni association
- an annual solicitation program

- an alumni association which provides annual financial support to the institution
- an institution which commits resources to employ alumni staff and carry on the annual operations
- automatic membership of the alumni
- a campus alumni office with a full time director and other full and/or part-time staff

My fourth conclusion was evolved through fitting the nine most successful alumni operations to the five factors previously noted. The nine institutions which I selected as having the highest rankings in the 12 success indicators were fitted to the five-part model with the six factors.

Thus, I had five, six and nine variable factors.

The nine institutions selected were: Shippensburg State College, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Marshall, Illinois State, North Texas State, Wichita State, Idaho State, Bowling Green State and Ball State Universities.

The effectiveness of the alumni associations in these institutions fully demonstrates the hypothesis of my study that alumni can be effectively involved in the mission and development of public institutions of higher education.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that older institutions, located in or near small population or rural communities, with a variety of five or more professional programs and with a sizable number of alumni are more successful in their programs and give greater promise for success in the future than other institutions in the study.

The age of the alumni association is not so significant as the other factors. It is the quality of the current leadership, building upon the other factors, which has led to their success.

There were a number of recommendations resulting from the study. The following applied to the alumni association:

- A program of alumni education for upper-division students should be held each year to alert them to the role of alumni in the life of their college.
- Sub-association groups which would provide alumni an opportunity to work with students and faculty on on-campus activities: homecoming, founder's day, etc.
- The alumni association should undertake a searching appraisal of its current role.
- A program of annual giving should be initiated, whenever possible in conjunction with a general development program of the college, and with emphasis on giving according to ability and a sense of responsibility.

A second set of recommendations pertains to the colleges and universities. First, whenever possible, the governing board and the president should directly involve alumni in institutional life.

Second, the institution's faculty and staff should utilize the alumni association as a field army to assist in making the institution a good place in which to learn.

The role of the alumni in the development of your institution in the 70's must certainly be centered upon these areas: First, a commitment of support by the president; second, the development of a loyal-alumni orientation of the students on the campus; and third, the identification of the alumni with the problems and needs of the institution so they can carry the case and needs of the university to the general public and the legislature.

THE COMMON MARKET PLAN FOR STUDENTS IN A STATE COLLEGE SYSTEM

G. THEODORE MITAU

Within the past year, we have begun an exciting and in many ways unique cooperative educational program in the Minnesota state college system. For reasons that will soon become obvious to you, we call it the Minnesota State College Common Market Program. We feel this plan may very well provide a model for other state college systems around the country.

The purpose of the Common Market, very briefly, is threefold. First, it permits a degree of diversification in education which could otherwise not be attained. Secondly, it seeks to avoid unwarranted duplication, and thirdly, it aims to provide students with a greatly enriched educational opportunity.

Many people cooperated in its development. My gratitude goes to Dr. Stanley Wagner, now president of Oklahoma State College, because he played a very prominent part in the development in the early stages. President Nickerson of Mankato State College, President DuFresne of Winona State College, President Wick of St. Cloud State College, President Decker of Bemidji State College, President Dille of Moorhead State College and President Bellows of Southwest State College at Marshall, Minnesota–all are contributing greatly.

Before describing the program, let me say a word about the Minnesota state college system. There are six state colleges located strategically throughout the state. There is, however, no state college presently serving the twin city metropolitan area of Minneapolis and St. Paul which contains about 60 per cent of the state's population.

A dozen years ago, enrollment in these colleges totaled about 7,000 students. Today they enroll about 37,000 students, and five years hence the Minnesota state college system will have to provide educational opportunities for 61,000 students, a total which exceeds that of the University of Minnesota in the twin city area.

The history of the Minnesota state college system is a familiar one. The colleges were created by the first Minnesota legislature in 1858 as two-year normal schools. By 1919, there were five institutions, and in the years following World War I, the curriculum was expanded and the normal schools became four-year state teachers colleges.

Beginning in 1957, the colleges began to broaden their curricular objectives and to assume the character of multi-purpose institutions with greatly strengthened offerings in the liberal arts and sciences. The system has undergone rapid and significant change as it sought to adapt itself to the new and pressing demands for staff improvement, expanded academic facilities and greater public service.

Of particular import to the development of the system were the accomplishments of the 1969 legislative session. With the support of the governor and the education-oriented legislative leaders, we were able to obtain fiscal infusions into the state college system which will greatly enhance our opportunities for quality improvement and growth.

As a result of increased appropriations and tuition increases, we were given the resources to improve faculty salaries 10 per cent for the first year of the biennium and six per cent for the second year. We were able to increase library supplements by $3.4 million and to supplement by $1 million all purchases of educational laboratory equipment. We were able to employ 485 supportive employees—clerical, custodial and maintenance—and to establish a $200,000 faculty improvement program which provides partial financial aid to teachers who wish to return to school for advanced study.

Our building program appropriations were funded at $28.8 million, or 70 per cent of the board's original request to the legislature.

All in all, by providing us with 91.5 per cent of what the board had asked for, compared with 63.7 per cent for the previous biennium, the decisions of the 1969 legislative session will permit us to make a number of significant advances toward educational quality improvement, a good beginning for our proposed six-year upgrading program.

While we are greatly satisfied with the funding we received at the '69 session, we are fully aware that we may have reached the optimum level of state appropriations. Minnesota is a medium-wealth state, ranking twenty-first among the states in terms of per capita income but eleventh with respect to spending for higher education. We have probably reached the point where there will be no further massive fund increases voted by the legislature.

I might add, parenthetically, we have embarked upon a program of increased alumni giving.

Indeed many of our taxpayers view the rising costs of state colleges and of the other components of higher education, such as the junior colleges and the University of Minnesota, with increasing alarm. This, of course, is in no way unique to Minnesota. The fiscal crisis in higher education demands attention at all state capitols and in Congress, at corporation board meetings and at foundation headquarters.

There is no doubt in my mind that, during the 70's, serious money shortages will remain chronic and will continue to plague higher education in Minnesota and throughout the nation.

Among a wide and influential segment of the public, there is a growing conviction that higher education is unnecessarily expensive. College and university administrators will have an increasing obligation to employ their imagination and creativity in the exploration of every possible approach that might reduce costs without damaging the quality of education.

It is our responsibility to experiment with new patterns and programs of instruction. As the University of California faculty committee recommended recently, we shall have to improve our instructional efficency by decreasing the time spent by both faculty and student in the transmission of facts. We must make greater use of electronic media for instruction, programmed learning and closed circuit television.

Most of all, we shall have to increase cooperation within and between systems of higher education in the planning and utilization of valuable instructional resources. These could usefully be shared by a wider range of students and researchers and thus help to avoid expensive and unwarranted duplication.

Fortunately, Minnesota has already made important moves in the direction of facilitating inter-institutional cooperation. For example, arrangements between Moorhead State College, Concordia College and North Dakota State University permit students to study at either of the other colleges on tuition paid to the first college. Included are joint evening school offerings and coordinated purchase of library material.

In another program, Winona State College and two private colleges, St. Teresa and St. Mary's, have coordinated their library acquisition, their faculty exchange and access to computer service. St. Cloud State College also cooperates with two private colleges, St. John's and St. Benedict's, in the development of Asian studies and in their tri-college honors program.

At least six private colleges in the twin city area have worked out plans with the University of Minnesota to share professors, graduate students and certain library resources.

In the spirit of furthering a more rational enrichment of the curriculum, as well as a more economic allocation of educational resources, not only between but within systems as well, we proposed to our six state colleges, in October of '68, the state college Common Market program which would open doors to students who would like to move freely within the state college system.

The proposal had these major features:

- It permits the student to move freely among the six state colleges, taking advantage of curricular and program specialties not available at their own institution.
- It provides students with the full resources of the Minnesota state colleges and eliminates the need to offer every specialized course at every college. It goes without saying that every institution has to have an inner sphere program that meets their institutional needs and their regional service. We are talking about the outer sphere of specialized instruction.
- The Common Market offers students the opportunity for a broader educational experience by sampling the different intellectual and social climates at each of the state colleges.
- To become eligible, students must spend one year in residence at a state college.
- The state college student will not lose any credit while at another state college, and his grades will be recorded as if he had been on his home campus.
- There's a Common Market students' director on each campus to

assist Common Market students with program counseling, housing arrangements, job hunting, and other needs.

We also pointed out to both faculty and students that the Common Market would offer opportunities for creativity which had not heretofore been available at the separate colleges. We noted that within the framework of the Common Market, each college would be free to develop its own unique curricular and academic personality, to experiment with innovative approaches to learning and to teaching.

One of the major objectives is the development of six diverse institutions, each helping to strengthen a rapidly growing system whose primary concern is the offering of quality undergraduate education to our young men and women. The Common Market encourages and reinforces this diversity.

Within three months after the Common Market was proposed, students and faculties of the six colleges gave their approval and the pilot phase of the program was under way. Twenty-one students were enrolled last spring quarter, and while this was a modest beginning, the first signs of creativity which we had hoped this program would foster began to appear.

The leadership of the education departments of the six state colleges came together last spring and designed an inner-city student teacher project. In the past, student teaching opportunities were limited to geographic areas adjacent to each of the state colleges. Only two of the colleges sent their student teachers into the Minneapolis and St. Paul area, and most of the teaching by state college students was done in the surburban communities rather than in the core city schools.

This new project, the first in which any department within the Minnesota state college system had worked on a joint venture of this scope, makes it possible for a prospective teacher at any Minnesota state college who is interested in inner city teaching experience to get it as part of a system program. For a system which supplies two-thirds of Minnesota's teachers, we believe this move into the inner city alone is justification for the Common Market program.

In the second quarter of the Common Market, we have about 75 students enrolled in the program and we are beginning to hear of Common Market projects on the drawing boards at the colleges. For example, one college is preparing a special Common Market quarter. It will identify and publicize programs in related fields which will be offered as a special one-quarter package for Common Market students.

This year the colleges are finding that with a 37,000 student systemwide enrollment to draw on, overseas travel study program, summer workshops and other special programs have far greater participation than in the past.

The program is beginning to emerge from its pilot stage. This Fall we publish our first Common Market brochure. It profiles each college and is available to campus Common Market directors and to interested students.

To help publicize the Common Market among students, we designed six travel posters for display in academic buildings, student unions and dormitories. We have a goal for the immediate future of something like a thousand students participating in Common Market programs.

For the Common Market to work effectively, it must have the enthusiastic support of the entire campus community. It cannot and must not be decreed by a chancellor or by a board or by the chancellor's staff. The operating details and the substantive policies of the Common Market must emerge from joint faculty-student-administrator committees which discuss and probe the nature and the potential of local resources and needs. Out of such careful and critical deliberation, first within each college and then eventually between sister campuses, should grow a respect and appreciation for the system's broader academic community.

The chancellor's office can only propose new ideas, suggest possible alternatives and provide the essential coordination. Up to this time, my overburdened staff has not had the time to give the program the necessary leadership.

Just recently, we learned that the Hill Family Foundation of St. Paul will award us a grant to support a full time professional Common Market coordinator for the first half of 1970. At the end of that period, the foundation has said it will entertain a request for further funding.

The reaction to the Common Market program has been excellent. To our state legislators, to business and professional people, to writers of newspaper editorials, this is a program that makes good sense. The inherent potential for economy without sacrificing quality, the additional dimension to the educational experience and the incentive for cooperative long-range planning has enormous appeal.

This is an era of building bridges between colleges and systems of colleges, between the private and the public sector, between the campus and the community. We are learning to share our scarce library offerings, laboratory facilities and faculty talent. Hopefully, our success with this program will bring closer the day when common markets will involve all of Minnesota's colleges and universities, public and private, so that we can make the widest use of our educational resources and offer our students and faculties the most enriching combination of educational opportunity.

CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

WILLIAM E. DAVIS

My topic, campus governance, is a broad topic, indeed, and I have narrowed it down, particularly to the point of student participation in university governance.

As preface, let me say my institution, Idaho State University, has about 6,400 students. I'm not going to fragmentize and identify different sections of the student body; my interest is to unify it and pull it together with a common purpose and identity. I'm concerned with attitude, because I think attitude determines the climate wherein education can either flourish or be destroyed.

Idaho prides itself on being one of America's last frontiers. In fact, our campus is so close to the primitive area that when a long haired, bearded student shows up from Lead Ore or Mud Lake, we don't know whether he represents the "now" generation or one of Brigham Young's nineteenth century missionaries.

At any rate, the friendly natives are not over-awed by college presidents, and at times their attitude can be downright irreverent. For example, it was about two short years ago that a sportswriter from a neighboring community nominated me for the idiot of the year award. He was taking exception to the fact that Idaho State University students were having an all-school referendum on whether or not the student body wanted to continue to support the varsity athletic program and whether they wished to recommend a fee increase to finance construction of a covered sports arena.

The irate editor concluded, "If $20,000 a year college presidents need advice from students on this type of situation, they certainly aren't worth their pay." And in a larger sense, he was probably asking the question, "Who is in charge?" But also in a larger sense, to us on the campus the referendum symbolized a partnership between students and administration.

In a proposed project involving a student facility, student activities and a revenue bond based on student fees, the endorsement of the student body was a vital factor. From the beginning, students were involved in the planning of the new facility. The seating capacity of our existing football stadium was limited to 6,500 people and income from gate receipts per year totaled less than $20,000. Student fees virtually carried the entire athletic program, excluding staff salaries paid from the university's general fund.

We first investigated the possibility of tearing down or expanding our old stadium, but the cost seemed prohibitive for a facility that would be used only a dozen or so times a year. Then we hit upon an even more exciting idea; namely the construction of a covered sports arena, large enough to house a football field and a 12,000 seat stadium.

The final plan also included a portable basketball court, portable indoor track with a 220 yard circumference and a 140 yard straightaway. The programming would include physical education classes from 8 o'clock to 2:30 each day, varsity athletic practice from 2:30 to 7 o'clock and intramurals in the evening.

In addition to the varsity and intramural athletic events and football, basketball and track, numerous entertainment and cultural activities could be scheduled in this facility. Utilization would extend for the whole school year.

The project's cost came to $2 million including the artifical turf, all fixtures, heating, lighting and parking. The total package was referred to members of the student senate, and, like the good politicians they are, they called an all-school referendum. The total financing of the athletic program and the proposed sports arena were discussed at length. With 85 per cent of the students voting, the plan received substantial endorsement along with a fee increase to finance the new facility.

The building is nearly complete and should be ready for use in 1970. Meanwhile, a stadium board of six students and five faculty and staff will formulate policies for control and use of the facility. Thus, the students will continue to have a major voice in the utilization and administration of this arena.

The sports facility is but one example of continuous and overall effort to involve students in affairs and decision-making within the university and allow them to come to grips with significant issues on the campus, particularly those which affect them. The student contributions have been numerous and significant. What students lack in continuity and background, I have found that they more than make up for in terms of creativity and freshness of ideas.

I would also add that their impatience with red tape and maintenance of the *status quo* is stimulating.

As with all other governing groups, including faculty and standing committees within the university, student government is aware that all of its actions are advisory only, that the final authority in decision-making is vested in the board of trustees. But students are also reminded of the real power they possess—the power of their ideas and the power of their persuasiveness, which I feel should prevail on the university campus.

Likewise, we focus attention on the fact that students actually control no university funds *per se*, that the student fees collected at registration time go into the total university budget with a certain portion delegated back to student government to finance their various sponsored activities.

As with all other university agencies, student government presents a proposed budget to the board which is approved and later audited. The concept of fiscal responsibility is essential, not only in the management of student affairs but also in their relationship to the total university. We, therefore, make clear to student government leaders that our books are open, that there are no secrets and if they have questions, they will be answered.

In addition to explaining the total financing of the institution, we try to familiarize them with our budget requests and the critical data underlying the decisions that have to be made. This involves a continuous re-education with each incoming student senate but the time and effort are justified.

With but one exception, every fee increase over the past five years has originated with a request from the student government. These fee increases include such items as a $5 increase for library acquisition, $6 for the scholarship program, $1 for alumni membership and $14 for the stadium bond issue.

Student government has also provided the impetus for a married student housing project. Now that it is becoming a reality, students are actively engaged in formulating the policies and procedures for its management.

Student governments at colleges throughout the state were also instrumental in the state board's action in adopting a speaker policy for all the state-supported institutions of higher learning, one that withstood the test of action. A student moderator has been the only other person sharing the platform with a speaker. Members of the audience respected the decisions of the chair, there have been no unsavory incidents, and the atmosphere of meetings has been appropriate to a university setting.

This has also been true with moratoriums, peace marches and various political activities. There is a real pride in maintaining the campus as an open forum for ideas while at the same time respecting the principle that an individual's freedom does not include the right to trample upon or deny freedom of thought or expression or entrance or egress to others. Such a philosophy cannot be handed down by administrative edict; it has to come from the students themselves.

One outstanding student activity on our campus revolves around an organization called Project Outreach, a kind of local Vista program organized and administered entirely by students. At last count, some 480 students had volunteered for projects ranging from working with Indians on the Fort Hall Reservation or disadvantaged persons from ghetto areas in our region to establishing a halfway house for the rehabilitation of patients from the state hospital.

These student volunteers serve as tutors for potential dropouts, teach courses in basic adult education, supervise recreational activities for youngsters, babysit for mothers so they can take special training classes in vocational fields or clean up rundown neighborhoods. The scope of their activities is almost as endless as their sights are high. They raise their own funds, secure their own grants and occasionally stub their own toes, but their efforts are an inspiration to our entire campus.

Two of the outstanding leaders in this Project Outreach program are black students, one of whom was vice-president of our student body last year. Also I would point out that the editor of our student newspaper this year is a black student, and the homecoming centennial football queen was also a black. There is a rather informal orientation program for students from minority groups within the institution but the most important thing is the general attitude which makes black students feel that they're wanted and that they, indeed, do have an opportunity to serve and to assume roles of responsibility and leadership in our institution.

Student leadership has also responded well in times of crisis. This Fall a free-for-all took place during the halftime of our football game against Weber State. Some of our heroes took exception to a banner and stole it, touching off a brawl that would do justice to a Green Bay Packer-Chicago Bears game.

The spectacle was so distasteful that the student body became indignant. Disciplinary action was taken against both groups and individuals who had participated, and positive steps were taken to see that such an unsportsmanlike incident would not take place again.

Perhaps the important principle, however, is that the concern and discipline came from within. The administration's role became one of reinforcement rather than initiative.

Students serve on virtually every standing committee in the university, including the graduate council and curriculum. Again, this keeps the channels of communication open and assures the students that there are no plots or secrets or mysteries. Students also learn that serving on such committees isn't all romance and glory but often boils down to unglamorous hard work and detailed planning.

One outgrowth of student participation on the curriculum committee was the introduction of courses for credit to be selected on current topics of student choice. The faculty's responsibility was to see that these courses were academically sound and taught by qualified persons. This led to a course on black studies which was introduced without pressure or furor and paved the way for further developments in this area or related fields.

Through participation on standing committees, students also learn that there often are no simple answers. Perhaps the outstanding example in this area was the campus traffic and parking committee composed almost exclusively of students and faculty. The administration agreed to abide by whatever policies were forthcoming. One year we had no parking regulations whatsoever, and the chaos was something to behold.

With so much leadership emanating from within the ranks of the student body, some smart reporter may ask, "What does the administration, or more specifically, the president, do to earn all that money?" Concerning the president's relationship with student government and the student body, I humbly offer a few suggestions, realizing that in this field there are no experts, just varying degrees of ignorance.

The president can try to see that student government doesn't become embalmed in the routine housekeeping chores and the smell of paper clips. He can do this by continually confronting it with the problems and issues facing the university, whether it be the planning of a new building or securing funds for a new academic or student program. Nothing kills the effectiveness of student government faster than the mickey mouse tag.

The president can also keep his staff vital and effective by the appointment of outstanding student leaders to administrative posts, particularly in the student personnel area.

He can also let the students know that the university is not being run primarily for the benefit of the faculty but rather for the education of students, and that anything that significantly improves the latter has a high priority. The student has a right to good and conscientious teaching and sound and fair administration.

The president can also make himself available. The open door policy cannot be a mere phrase. It has to be a symbol of free and easy access and communication where no student problem is too small or insignificant to get fair and immediate attention. Students seldom bother you with a small problem. If they take the time to call you at home or visit your office, they have a big problem, at least for them.

To ensure this personal identification and relationship, the president has to get out among the students. This doesn't mean he has to be one of them because students resent that, but it is important that he be with them. This calls for an almost systematic approach. The technique will vary for each person, but I spend an hour a week or more with the student body president. I try to see the editor of the student paper and tell him, "If you have problems, bring them here. Don't make me read about them in the newspaper."

A series of informal meetings with each of the residence halls and living organizations provides insight into student concerns and invites the personal contact so vital in one's understanding of his own campus. And whether the college event is a track meet or the latest dramatic production, it is good for the president to be there.

In spite of my attendance here, I still hold with the theory that a president on the campus is worth two in the air. A president through his administration and actions must demonstrate confidence in the leadership and mature judgment of students. To be sure, there will be disappointments, but an institution can tolerate a lot of errors. This is not so with the individual student, to whom his education is a very personal thing. If a university is to err in judgment, then let it err on the side of the student.

For those who are concerned about who is running the university, I would say that the heavy-handed administration not only is not wanted, it is not needed when students sense they have a full partnership in the university. Thus, in working with student government, the administration should be supportive to the extent that if the students cannot handle a situation, the university will, but in most instances only after letting the students try first.

Now, after all these pompous pronouncements, my next phone call will probably be from the dean of students informing me that the administration building has just been occupied. This will serve as a reminder that in working with students, peace is never final and defeat is always close at hand. But what a great consolation it is to know that within each entering freshman class lies either the seeds of democratic leadership or bloody rebellion and that the role of the president is to approach that uncertain future with the calm confidence of a poker-playing Christian with a pair of deuces betting into a pat hand.

INCREASING QUALITY AND ECONOMY THROUGH COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

ALBERT BROWN

My remarks will cover computer-assisted instruction and programs of individualized instruction being developed at State University College at Brockport over the past few years.

Individualized instruction is good instruction for the student. It makes for efficient use of faculty resources, and is economical to carry out. Its use allows for growth and for flexibility in scheduling. Changes in content and curriculum are easily instituted.

Our revised biology program has been in operation for about three years. We put about a thousand students through each year in a very individualized program.

We have 44 carrels operating. No longer do we use a single television set for the tutorial but, rather, we have dialed access television with a standard module set on the right, a dial mechanism in the center and a television screen on the left.

In less than 60 seconds any one of the 15 modules that are on any particular tape can be recovered, so the student has access to all the different locally made television shorts. He can come in and look them over any time that particular section is open.

By buying particular kinds of films from the Smithsonian Institution and other sources, we're able to put together all kinds of television sessions using electronic microscopic shots, etcetera.

In lectures preceding laboratory sessions, psychology students are introduced to basic concepts of respondent and operant conditioning. Specific scientific techniques of behavior theory are then employed by each student as he controls the stimulus input to produce desired animal results.

In beginning biology programs, laboratory experiments are all individualized. The student proceeds at his own pace through each experimental module, scheduling his lab to suit his own convenience.

Statistics is completely individualized at Brockport. It has no regular meeting times or even a required number of exposures. Proceeding completely on his own, guided by detailed lesson plans, the student may listen to taped lectures accompanied by chalkboard-oriented diagrams or he may read in a variety of conventional and programmed texts and/or attend small group sessions with an instructor.

Our statistics laboratory houses the calculating machines and one local, time-sharing teletype machine. The basic course currently serves a variety of needs in several social science areas and is supported by both NSF and USOE funds.

We have a computer-assisted instruction unit, and several courses allow students to seek remedial or enrichment materials outside the normal lecture time at typewriter terminals. Probably most unique is a music theory course supported by the state research fund and most promising is an interdisciplinary developmental program with substantial Esso Foundation support. About a half dozen programs of computer-assisted instruction will be developed with the help of this grant.

One of our computers has a terminal connected to the campus data processing computer and is available for student use about six hours in the evening and at times when the machine would otherwise be unused. This dual use of the computer helps make computer-assisted instruction economically feasible.

In addition to computer-assisted instruction materials, there is a machine on which students perform simulation and modeling experiments. Successful problem simulation within the physics department has led one professor to seek related applications in other qualified areas, again with the support of USOE funds. A machine also assists in counselling of computer science students with a data bank of stored grades that may be consulted at any time to note student progress in a particular course.

Students in various disciplines that emphasize individualized instruction still need to have their progress evaluated. This normally would require more than a single instructor to read exams for a large class. An optical device electronically reads and scores 2,000 sheets per hour. At the same time, the answers are punched into cards for input into computer programs that produce printed output for both the student and the instructor. These show averages, item analysis, reliability indices, distribution histograms and a list of the grades to post.

An economical way to begin or to expand computer-assisted instruction is provided by the use of teletype terminals linked by telephone lines to remote computers. We are fortunate in the Rochester area to have four time-sharing firms competing to sell time. They provide an inexpensive and convenient way to obtain the computer power of a large machine.

These computer-assisted and individualized programs are newly under way at Brockport. The student has not felt any sense of neglect in the process but has felt, rather, that these programs have been instituted so that he can work at his own rate, repeating certain functions whenever he feels this is necessary.

URBAN HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE 70's

RICHARD C. VAN DUSEN
JAMES A. REID
JAMES E. HAYES
CARLISLE PARKER

59 (no p.60)

RICHARD C. VAN DUSEN

At a time when nearly three-fourths of America lives in urban areas, the word urban becomes almost too comprehensive to be useful as a descriptive adjective.

What do we mean by urban higher education? Are we talking about an urban curriculum? Is there an urban physics or chemistry or calculus which differs from rural physics or chemistry or suburban calculus? Is Black Studies urban or rural?

I recognize that a case can be made for the existence of a body or bodies of academic knowledge regarding the cities and their people. Urban planning is a recognized discipline. Public administration is another. Anthropology, sociology and political science all have substantial urban components.

Should we consider the topic "Urban Higher Education for the 70's," in terms of the special problems of offering education in urban settings like New York or Berkeley, for example? I don't think that's what we have in mind.

Nor should we center on discipline, parietal rules, or maintaining the tranquility of urban campuses; you've had enough advice from government officials on those subjects.

In my view, the relevance of our discussion will be less a function of the processes of the academy—curricula, student-faculty relationships, admissions policy and the like—and more a function of the direct involvement of institutions of higher education in the effort to meet the problems of our cities.

The next logical question is—"What kind of direct involvement?"

Traditionally, there has been a tendency to regard research and recommendation as the appropriate form of academic participation. We have a problem—so we decide to find out what the best minds in the country think about it. Government commissions a study by Harvard, or MIT, or Stanford or the University of Michigan. The study is undertaken with great diligence and eventually results in a lengthy report full of graphs, charts, footnotes and bibliography.

The trouble is that by the time the report is ready the official who commissioned it has forgotten he asked for it and is too busy to read it—if he's still in office. Of course, if he's left office, his successor will assume that this was just another of the silly ideas of the prior administration.

Now, I don't mean to suggest that government shouldn't tap the best academic talent. Certainly this administration has done so. Henry Kissinger, Secretaries Shultz and Hardin, Paul McCracken and Patrick Moynihan are impressive representatives of the academic community, whose impact on foreign and domestic policy is very great indeed.

And the President has sought help from the academic community in task force evaluations of many of our domestic programs.

There is no question that the nation can benefit from the application of the intellectual resources of our campuses to the problems of people crowded together in big cities. There is value to having megabrains thinking mega thoughts about these mega problems.

But the translation of these mega thoughts into action is a difficult, slow process, full of frustration for all concerned. John Kenneth Galbraith used to comment on this in a lecture on the farm problem in an introductory course in economics at Harvard. The lecture went something like this:

> "We have a farm problem in this country. Every year I am called to Washington to solve the farm problem. Every year I tell Congress and the White House how to solve the farm problem. Every year I am ignored. That is why we have a farm problem in this country."

The fact is that there are limitations to the effectiveness of the process of academic development of broad solutions to the problems of the cities.

I suggest that the most effective involvement of colleges and universities in the solution of metropolitan problems during the decade of the 70's will be direct and local. This is the direction in which many of your institutions are now moving. I'd like to applaud and encourage you in that effort.

Let me sharpen the focus a bit. It is likely that all your institutions are located in communities with what we think of as urban problems—congestion, inadequate housing, rent strikes, black-white tensions, blight, underemployment, poverty, to name a few—because so many of these problems are not peculiar to big cities.

Of course, government at the Federal, state and local levels has programs to deal with these problems. But the programs we administer at HUD and many other Federal programs as well depend to a high degree for their success on local initiative and action—both public and private.

We don't build or manage housing, for example. Such local sponsors as public housing authorities, non-profit organizations, cooperatives, and others take the initiative and do the work. HUD provides guidance and financial assistance.

HUD doesn't plan or execute urban renewal projects. That's a local undertaking. We just provide guidance and money.

The Model Cities program seeks to attack the causes of blight and poverty. But the plans are developed and administered locally, with a high degree of community participation.

Whether government participates or not, there is a great need for direct involvement of local institutions and individuals in the solution of urban problems.

Because your institutions are a repository of diverse talents and disciplines and because you have a particular prestige in your communities, you can serve as an effective catalyst in applying local talent to the solution of these problems. Through your efforts the community expertise can be energized.

You may not, for example, be able to turn unemployed black youths into automobile mechanics, but you can set up the framework for doing so and motivate those with the necessary experience and knowledge to contribute.

Here are two more examples from among the infinite variety of contributive involvement open to your institutions.

The first relates to helping low-income tenants of subsidized housing. Our housing stock is deteriorating far more rapidly than it should. Public housing and other multi-family housing for low-income families are frequently plagued by excessive maintenance costs, vandalism, and squalor resulting from the fact that tenants haven't been adequately prepared for the responsibilities of occupancy.

Secretary Romney recently dedicated a Federally assisted apartment building in Memphis, where 90 per cent of the tenants had never before lived with indoor toilet facilities. Without instruction, such inexperienced tenants would be likely to plug up a lot of plumbing, causing damage and deterioration.

In one new housing development in New York, though, every new tenant was given a six-week course, developed and taught by an urban university, in basic home-making and tenant responsibilities. The results in improved maintenance and tenant attitudes have been quite pronounced. Your institutions can take the initiative in making this kind of service available in your own communities.

A second area where you can help is in technical assistance and guidance to citizens affected by Federal programs. In the Model Cities program, residents of the blighted neighborhood take an active part in planning to meet the neighborhood's needs. Urban renewal programs also call for citizen participation. Experts on your faculties can be enormously helpful to citizen groups confronted with the awesome new experience of developing or evaluating a Model Cities plan for coordinated attack on the causes of blight and poverty. You can help them assess needs, establish priorities, and develop solutions.

Perhaps most important, you can be a part of the orderly introduction into our political processes and institutions of people who have been hostile, alienated or apathetic. The value of citizen participation lies not in confrontation between citizens and the establishment, but in bringing the citizen participators into the system in a constructive way.

But whether you're the catalyst in the development of a job training program, or the operator of a tenant counseling course, or lending your resources to guide citizens into effective participation in our political institutions—there is a common thread. In each case you'll be directly involved in solving an urban problem.

The importance of this effort becomes truly critical in light of this administration's decisions to turn over to local units of government the responsibility for dealing with essentially local problems. There is a significant historical process involved in the New Federalism.

Power accumulated in Washington primarily because local units of government were unable or unwilling to solve these problems. Now the Federal government has become increasingly less capable of applying its resources effectively to the solution of local problems. We are therefore turning the responsibility back to the government closest to the people, and, by implication, most responsive to their desires.

The danger in this is that if local government fails in carrying out its responsibilities there would seem to be no further resort in the political process, and the increasingly frustrated and embittered residents of our cities would act accordingly.

There is a clear parallel here between the burden of responsibility now being placed on local government and the efficacy of your own endeavors. Your community–not Washington–is now where the action is, and your local officials are going to need every bit of your support.

Whether the New Federalism is to be a success–and I suggest that there is no rational alternative–will depend, in part, on the leadership of the business, professional, and intellectual institutions who inevitably will prosper or decay within their own communities.

Your leadership need not be tied to specific government programs. The important thing is that you assume it and that your efforts are directed not just to long range speculation about the problems in toto, but seek immediate solutions to the day-to-day problems of life in America's cities.

The AASCU mini-grant program, supported by the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, provided grants to newly appointed or about-to-be appointed urban affairs or community relations directors to visit and observe an on-going urban program at another institution. The grantee thus gathered first-hand information with a view toward adapting it to the needs of his own institution. The three speakers in this session were recipients of mini-grants.

JAMES A. REID

The Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies serves as a catalyst for local universities, to help raise the level of urban studies in the universities, to provide leadership in coordinating and strengthening their programs and to serve as a channel for bringing their talents and resources to bear upon the problems of the metropolis.

According to Dr. Ross Hansen, president of the Center, it is now in the process of re-examining its programs and activities. There are new forces and institutions in metropolitan Washington, and the Center finds that the traditional approach to an understanding of the system through which the metropolis functions maybe inadequate. Over the next three years the Center proposes a new approach which will enable it to define this system. Then, through its research programs, the Center will assist in developing policies to deal with the problems which urban growth has imposed upon metropolitan life and form.

The Center's activities include assisting in planning new communities–for example, the community of Columbia City in Maryland. Rapid transit systems, the social life of modern communities, and the reformation and decentralization of big city government are other Center concerns.

In addition to conferences with Dr. Hansen and members of his staff, the visit afforded several unique experiences—a Senate subcommittee hearing on the decentralization of the District government, a management intern seminar at American University, a tour of Columbia City and a conference with its president and key officials, and an enlightening conference with the vice-mayor of the District of Columbia.

The basic task of a proposed urban affairs center at Florida A & M University will be to make its resources available to develop an urban studies program and to provide leadership in helping the university and the community develop viable programs leading to the amelioration of major social, economic and political problems. My observation of the programs and activities of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, therefore, was an experience which provided valuable information for enhancing these efforts.

Some of our programs will study local and state programs—urban renewal, housing and urban development, Federal housing programs, Model Cities programs and related race relations programs. The first joint effort between Florida A & M University and Florida State University was a statewide conference for black elected officials funded by the Southern Regional Council. Its purpose was to bring together for the first time all the black elected officials in the state to discuss their accomplishments, their mutual problems and to encourage students to become more interested in the political affairs of the community and the nation.

There were panel discussions, workshops, and a special address by Julian Bond, a member of the Georgia legislature. We hope that this will become an annual affair for Florida's black officials. It was well attended and enjoyed by all participants.

In the South, black political participation is still in its infancy, as evidenced by the 30 black elected officials in Florida. This number, while a very small segment of the state political machinery, clearly points out that potential black voting power is now a political factor. In view of this fact, many questions must be answered if we are to understand how this new political system operates, how it affects the more traditional system and the extent to which it contributes to the political and social modernization of the black community.

To provide impetus to this new political development, the urban affairs center at Florida A & M University and the political research institute of Florida State University have joined with the voter education project of the Southern Regional Council in co-sponsoring this conference. Just recently we submitted a proposal to HUD for funds to develop an urban service center which would provide for internship programs and lead to the master's degree in urban education.

Question: You mentioned the political education program. Could you give some detail?

Mr. Reid: What we hope to do is establish internship programs within the various city agencies, the state and Federal government as a means of providing firsthand knowledge of the inner functioning of politics and the political machinery.

If you refer to the conference itself, it was designed to bring black elected officials together to discuss mutual problems and to determine what their research needs might be if they were to function with maximum effectiveness.

Mr. Greenlee: We had a similar program in Los Angeles involving the administrative assistants of black public officials, particularly legislators, city councilmen and county supervisor aides. There was no training program in California for this career ladder so we organized one with the assistance of Senator Domley, an alumnus of my college and the first black legislator in California. It ran for about two months, on Saturdays. We attempted to develop, out of their own needs, a better assessment of the resources at their command, and the common duties of the office, with the thought of improving the service. The value of and need for this kind of program may be indicated by the fact that we will have a followup this year which they themselves are financing.

JAMES E. HAYES

Central Michigan University is not in or even very near to a large urban setting. As a matter of fact, with our 13,000 students and faculty we actually constitute the biggest element in the community in which we're located. But our students come from urban places. And our faculty does attempt to address itself to problems of urban development, as it seems appropriate to the several disciplines.

Over two years ago we began an equality of educational opportunity program. One of its most dramatic features is a high-risk student program. The basic outlines of these programs are well known so I won't go into the details of ours. We feel it's successful; that is, it seems to be providing well for the students selected to participate. Even more important, it's had a stimulatory effect on people and programs on our campus. I think we have been flying blind, however. When we started, we had little more than a general outline of our plan. We have communicated with other campuses and visited them extensively. The minigrant program contributed to that effort, and it was a welcome contribution because dollars are hard to come by.

The interchange of experience has suggested that in our state, or perhaps area, a network of people involved in these programs had developed. We are quite well known to one another, now, and we hold the most profitable kinds of meetings—the sub-meeting to a meeting announced for other purposes.

When I began meeting with these people, about half of the network group was white. That has changed in the two-year period, and the directors of these programs now are black more frequently than not. My involvement with this group has been one of the most rewarding experiences in my career.

I hope that this kind of intimacy will continue. These programs provide an opportunity for a variety of people to learn, and the white ones like myself need it about as much as anybody.

Our experience suggests that several other programs in our state have had the same good effect as ours. Others, however, haven't. The significant finding, is that while these programs appear to have similar basic outlines – the phrase "high risk student program" suggesting some sort of common thing – the programs are extremely varying, with differences expressed in subtle rather than overt ways.

These differences are well known and appreciated by the various program directors and lieutenants who work in them. But I'm afraid that they're not very well known or appreciated by the various faculties, by the various student bodies and, I would suggest, even the various administrations.

The body of literature growing around such programs is not sufficient, I think, to the task of shaping new programs or to the revision of ongoing ones. Research is needed. We need to know more about admissions work, financial aid policy and administration, curricular and the even more important non-curricular programs, and the relationship of four-year institutions to two-year institutions.

Most high-risk programs are directed to solving race or ethnic group participation problems in higher education. But the real problem, broader than that, is how to make higher education available to those who are capable of it and who are motivated for it without regard to background circumstances and the ability to pay.

Our program is trying to prepare students so that in their working careers they can take part in the solution of urban problems. Several of these efforts remain in the planning stage, however. They require more money than is available for long-run program activities or for initial or pilot steps. We would like, for example, to capitalize on the experience of our Ford Foundation-sponsored program which trains vocational education teachers for secondary schools and community colleges. That program has tested and developed certain innovations in this area which we now think are sound.

Neither Federal nor foundation funds seem available, however, to translate our past efforts into a program to prepare urban disadvantaged, college-capable students for teaching careers in fields of great personnel shortage – a shortage, in particular, of personnel whose backgrounds are akin to the young with whom they will deal.

Funding for student support and for program development is much needed. But while money is needed for program expansion, at the moment the critical problem is keeping even. There is an uneasy feeling on my own and other campuses that even the levels of the past several years might not be maintained. If there should be a reduction, we must be prepared to deal with reaction from the communities, groups and individuals with whom we have been working.

Higher education spells hope and promise for the groups that we're attempting to serve, and we must not build a new cynicism in them. At all odds, support mechanisms must be maintained at least at current levels.

My institution, Central Michigan University, is primarily oriented to the undergraduate and to teaching but our effort must be connected to research as well. We have, for example, one of the few recreation departments in Michigan. This department wants to undertake research on new recreation programs for the urban complex areas. It believes that the recreation patterns of the past in the urban complex areas are not satisfactory to the people being served or to the governmental-political processes involved.

Our department has an expertise which is found few places elsewhere, at least in our region, but it lacks sufficient experience in the research effort it proposes, and it lacks the personnel required to direct and participate in the research program. In addition, an interdisciplinary effort is required with disciplines not adequately represented on our own campus.

Thus, if a good idea is to be realized, we must seek both funding and cooperation with other institutions to augment our efforts. The same needs pertain to a project our English department would like to undertake.

Innovation is being urged upon us and relevance is being urged upon us. I should like to see the planning agencies and leadership agencies with whom we deal in proposing such programs follow suit.

I have tried to make my presentation low key but I'm sure you recognize that it's a program which is highly keyed up.

We're new in this kind of program and perhaps this is one of the reasons it's important that an institution like ours be heard in this forum. It's easy to think of urban development activities or service to students as being restricted to institutions set in the metropolitan areas. But it's not enough to simply assist people we've neglected before or to develop programs to solve urban problems. It's a critical necessity to involve all colleges and universities, so that students in institutions like my own become familiar with and have some direct involvement with what's going on in the world and with the people and life of the cities.

CARLISLE PARKER

My institution, Paterson State College in New Jersey, is interested in establishing a center for urban affairs within the Model Cities area. Its function would be to set up an interdisciplinary approach by the college faculty in cooperation with the community to provide a variety of services to the city of Paterson. These services would be developed from the needs which the community itself has deemed imperative.

An AASCU mini-grant funded a two-day visit to Buffalo, New York where I visited the storefront centers, and SUNY-Buffalo's urban center. These recommendations resulted from the visit:

- that the college form a partnership with the poor, those most in need of education, the residents of the inner city, and, using the storefront approach, hustle or sell education on the street;

- that immediate planning between institutions of higher learning and the neighborhoods begin promptly to develop a meaningful program.

The college accepted the recommendation and proceeded with positive action.

In September of 1969, Paterson State College and Tombrock College, a junior college, jointly opened a college information center in the heart of Paterson's ghetto. The objectives of the center are:

- To provide information on educational questions;
- To provide specific assistance when possible to the community and its youth about colleges in the state;
- To provide opportunities for the students of both colleges to participate in Center's activities and to learn about conditions in poverty neighborhoods;
- To establish a relationship between the community and the cooperating colleges.

Students staffing the center are paid under the work-study program; the administrators volunteer their services. Representatives from other New Jersey colleges come to the Center to talk about admissions, discuss special programs and answer questions.

American education is already unique in its diversity. It now must become flexible in expanding. At Paterson we're reaching out to meet the needs of students and effect useful changes in existing structure and programs.

The college informational center, we hope, is just the beginning.

Question: Could you comment on the techniques Paterson used to sample community opinion and to get the community involved in the development of your program?

Mr. Parker: Let's start with some brief background on the city. It's a large city with a population about 40 per cent black, maybe 30 per cent Spanish-speaking–Puerto Rican, Cuban, Latin American or what have you–and the rest Caucasian.

It was a wealthy city. The silk industry was its power. Unfortunately, it's a dying city, in one sense.

Paterson State College began in the city of Paterson and, like many an institution, migrated to suburbia. It was not concerned with the problems of the inner city.

In 1968, Dr. J. K. Olsen came to Paterson State and along with him came the determination that the college should extend its help to the city.

We formed a community advisory group. It represented the community at large, and we tried to put emphasis on effective action.

The college informational center was opened in one of the most dilapidated, poverty-stricken areas in the city. We had a meeting to get in contact with the people who lived within that area, to find out how we could help.

The problem was that the minority students had much difficulty getting into college. Some had the grades, some had the potential, but they just didn't know how to go about it, and usually when they applied, it was too late, and so they never got in the door.

So the idea was developed with community leaders that we come up with a constructive program. Everything had always been done outside the community; this was to be a program where the community would be in the mainstream.

We had no money, and those of you that are with state institutions know we really have to fight for budgets. A religious order gave us the use of a building they owned in the ghetto area.

Our next problem was to devise an effective program. I contacted all of the state institutions asking for information on scholarships, grants, awards, and asking for display material on admissions. The response was very good.

Finally, I contacted the admissions officers and invited them to come down at least one evening during the week to hear about our program. All of them responded.

Now, what is our program? The real action is this—the black student, the Spanish student, once he enters the institution of higher learning, what can we do to bring him up, quote, to our traditional standards, unquote?

Our concern is to help him before he gets to that stage. We want to assist him so that when he enters the front door he will have the knowledge that he needs to function effectively in any institution, not only Paterson State. We are interested, of course, in having these students apply to Paterson State, but if a student wants to go to Montclair State or Jersey City, we feel that we have given him some knowledge of what he has to do.

Just a week ago we had a young man come in. He was in the 10th grade, interested in going into engineering, and didn't know what to take. Apparently he had been placed in programs like shop that were not geared to college. He wanted to know what the requirements were for an engineering institution.

We sat down with a representative from the Newark College of Engineering and mapped out his schedule for the next three years.

Now, I think this is positive action, and this is the type of action we definitely must have.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION FOR THE 70's

WILLIAM MARTIN

(no p.72)

WILLIAM MARTIN

Today's complex world calls for recognition of the essential unity of the globe, with its challenge to man to learn to live together. The need for a global outlook is scarcely controversial; we must have a high degree of cooperation and mutual understanding between nations.

To meet this need young Americans must have the opportunity to learn about other countries, peoples, and cultures, an opportunity which, to this point, has been lacking on most campuses. The pervasive isolationism of higher education in this country is revealed by the alarming number of students who complete their college studies without any work dealing with the non-Western world. As late as 1964, 90 per cent of liberal arts college graduates had not had a single course in non-Western cultures. In general social science, there is a short supply of teachers, particularly at the secondary school level, who are able to deal with non-Western problems and issues. The education of teachers in internationalism has not yet received concentrated attention or full-scale effort on the part of major educational organizations, government agencies, foundations, and universities.

This serious gap in the education of the growing generation comes at a time when there is much pressure on American higher education in the interest of relevancy. But no need for relevance is more important than that presented by the rapidly changing international scene. When the United Nations was founded in 1945, there were only four African states that could be classified as independent. Today, we count 42 independent nations in Africa. Certainly the emergence of these nations along with other countries which achieved independence during the same period has changed the focus of American foreign policy.

It is safe to say that, of the twentieth century influences on American education, potentially the greatest is the changed position of our country in world affairs. It is also safe to assert that this state of affairs has so far brought least response from the educational system.

Accordingly, at present and in the future we shall need informed college graduates who can make a substantial contribution to public understanding and who can deal dispassionately with issues and problems of international relations. These imperatives will follow in the wake of the growing involvement of the United States with other nations. The increased contact between the United States and foreign nationals through immigration, travel, and business will make it necessary that Americans have a broader capability in the fields of international affairs and intercultural understanding.

Howard A. Reed, of Education and World Affairs, feels as do many educators that higher institutions have a stellar role to play in working our way out of this dilemma. He states:

> Increased, informed awareness of world affairs and of at least one major, literate culture in addition to one's own should be the goal of any general educational program. The reasons are clear and basic. First, every major cultural tradition is intrinsically worth study as an expression of

> man's creative genius. Next, study of another culture based on prior, serious, and critical study of one's own civilization provides an indispensable perspective on that tradition. At the same time study can, in microcosm, supply the means by which each individual, having gained this fuller sense of identity, is more likely to discover his vocation, which can become the fulcrum by which, like Archimedes, he can move the world and thus truly begin to know himself. He will thus find his unique place in the world by becoming a more integrated, responsible individual and member of the human community.

In the modern world, then, a liberal or general education is incomplete without an effective international dimension. Then, too, it should be emphasized that liberal or general education confined to the Western tradition is no longer adequate or justifiable under present world conditions.

Before the end of the 70's, a good undergraduate education, should have an international component, preferably one related to the non-Western world. At this point in history and recognizing the factors which make such a study imperative, higher education can no longer be content with graduating students whose knowledge is restricted to the Western world.

Interdisciplinary or area courses may be the most effective way to provide an understanding of foreign cultures. Such courses may be taught by a single professor or a team of members of several departments. The area considered may be a continent, a region, or a national state, bringing together relevant knowledge from any or all disciplines to bear on the area under consideration. In a study of this type one should not consider a single aspect of a society or culture in isolation, but must treat the area as a social-cultural entity.

There is also a need for a full and enthusiastic commitment of faculty members involved in the value of international studies. The effort to provide an adequate, well-trained faculty in the field of international studies must, therefore, be given high priority.

A 1967 Office of Education task force proposed the following high priority international education tasks:

- The development of interdisciplinary courses, focusing on a geographic area or on a contemporary world problem, designed not for the specialist but for general students;
- The expansion of area studies programs and programs in international studies as comprehensive programs of undergraduate study;
- The development of courses in foreign language that stress the foreign culture and contemporary civilization;
- Greater experimentation with new theoretical models of undergraduate curricula, and specifically with models which place at their center the use of international materials to study interrelated problems in all fields;
- The preparation of texts and other instructional materials in international studies;

- The development of new programs to train college teachers to use newly-developed materials;
- The internationalization of elementary and secondary school teacher programs;
- Increased utilization of the talents of visiting foreign scholars;
- The development of programs to cover new problems which would be of immediate and long-range relevance for international education, such as decolonization or urbanization;
- Special support for courses in international communication beyond conventional language instruction, such as the language of music and dance.

Undergraduate study abroad is a useful instrument of international education and its striking possibilities for the 70's should be explored. In view of the mounting problems associated with these programs, however, colleges and universities could make a genuine contribution to the refinement of these programs by working out guidelines for their organization and administration. In this connection, consortium arrangements should be encouraged as a device to make available resources go as far as possible. One important advantage of consortium arrangements is that further proliferation of independent programs in congested study centers abroad may be limited. In promoting international understanding, close cooperation between program organizers in this country with their foreign colleagues is vital.

The existing programs of the Institute of International Studies are one potential source for assistance in projecting programs for the 70's. Some of the programs help develop curriculum materials for teaching about foreign countries on a variety of school levels. Others provide opportunities for training teachers and scholars in over a hundred foreign languages and help produce teaching materials for non-Western languages. Still other programs involve exchange teaching and specialized study abroad, research projects on foreign areas, cross-cultural studies of school achievement, and special in-service training programs on world affairs.

The U.S. Office of Education is currently helping state departments of education internationalize their staff and programs through summer seminars abroad. One-third of the chief state school officers are currently making a study tour of selected educational programs in Asia and the Middle East.

Among the more significant continuing services provided by the Office of Education to American education at all levels are: Teacher exchange, research and study abroad; foreign language and area centers and fellowships; contract research; and foreign curriculum consultants.

The Federal government has been sending American teachers abroad since 1946 to help them learn more about life in other countries. During the 1968-69 academic year, American teachers exchanged jobs with teachers from the United Kingdom, Germany, Australia, Austria, Canada, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Norway. Fifty-five Americans were awarded teaching posts abroad on a one-way, non-exchange basis under this program.

The Fulbright-Hays Act provides grants to enable American teachers and students to go overseas for research and study. Grants for this purpose go to graduate students planning to teach as well as to members of secondary schools, state departments of education and colleges and universities. Most of the awards are intended to further the study of non-Western languages. Within this category are grants to assist in conducting summer seminars, sending curriculum development teams overseas, and for supporting overseas group research and study.

This year, more than 90,000 students are involved in the work of 107 language and area centers established in 63 American colleges and universities under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act. These centers offer advanced training, usually at the graduate level in languages not traditionally taught in the United States but that have become vitally important to our country in recent years. In addition to language study, the centers usually offer several courses dealing with other aspects of the regions under study.

National Defense Education Act-financed research and curriculum development projects have been producing improved curriculums for teaching foreign languages in this country over the last decade. Since the research program began, American scholars have developed basic courses in 135 languages.

Large school systems, colleges, universities and state departments of education can improve curriculum on other countries and their languages by requesting the services of a curriculum consultant from the country they wish to study. About 30 foreign experts are brought to the United States each year to work with specific schools and educational agencies.

In addition to the services to American education, the Office of Education assists other countries in developing their educational programs, works with visiting educators, and cooperates with other government agencies in administering programs of technical assistance to educational leaders from other countries.

At the center of the Office of Education's concern for international education is the Institute of International Studies. The institute administers the programs already enumerated; it works closely with other bureaus in helping them expand and improve the international dimensions in many programs and serves as a central point of contact within the Office of Education for those interested in international education. The institute aims to:

- Communicate the concept that the national interest in education includes an international dimension;
- Increase our knowledge of the world and its people;
- Infuse an appropriate international dimension throughout the domestic educational program;
- Stimulate or support research and development projects designed to improve methods and materials for international education;
- Educate more specialists for international studies and services;
- Promote international understanding and cooperation.

The institute is especially interested in helping identify the relationship between problems of intercultural understanding within the United States and between the United States and other countries.

It is recognized that the cultural background of minority groups of our society are as seriously neglected in our formal educational system as are those of people of other lands. We need to strengthen teaching about the cultural backgrounds of minority groups in America within the broader context of appreciating the contribution of all cultures to mankind's common heritage.

With the help of several Institute of International Studies programs, higher education is now, for the first time, producing a stream of scholars who have strong backgrounds in history, anthropology, and other social sciences, along with a fully functional competence in foreign languages which until recently were rarely taught in the United States.

Obviously, there are many aspects of projecting a program of international education for the 70's which I have not touched upon. The choice of emphasis on undergraduate education at the general education level was made in the interest of making provisions for the largest number of students.

In summary, these are the aspects we have stressed:

- The present-day relevance of international study occasioned by the need for all men to learn to live together;
- The serious gaps that exist in the education of individuals who must live in today's world;
- The need to include an international dimension in undergraduate education;
- The availability of the Institute of International Studies as source of financial assistance in developing programs for the 70's.

It is now time for state colleges and universities to join hands in this exciting venture. We have conquered the wind and sand, and we no longer merely romanticize about reaching the stars. Yet nothing could lift us to greater heights than clasping the outstretched hands of what Carl Sandburg called the "family of man."

(no p. 78+79)

THE SCHOOL,
THE SCHOLAR, AND SOCIETY

O. MEREDITH WILSON

80

O. MEREDITH WILSON

In ancient times when trade was reawakened in Western Europe, trade routes clung close to walled towns and tradesmen with their goods stopped under the walls beseeching and paying for the protection of the lord of the castle. It was better to pay a price to one lord than to be exposed to the unknown dangers of the countryside. Faubourgs or dependent enclaves of merchants grew up around the town. Fairs were held in season; commerce grew; people became more prosperous, more specialized and more interdependent. From these enlarged communities created for protection and trade the modern city was born.

To some of these cities scholars came, seeking the same protection that attracted the merchants. But scholars were attracted, too, by the merchants' goods, and fairs. Then, as now, they liked to be where the action was. In unsettled times, the King of Naples or the King of England intervened to promise safety if the scholars of Pisa or Paris would migrate to their estates. So we may be justified in speaking as though the community of scholars was called into being by society to serve its social ends.

Kenneth Boulding, in describing the rise of the university, refers to the Pinocchio principle. Society fashioned its university like the woodcutter Geppeto fashioned his puppet. We set the university on its feet thinking to be served and pleased by our creature, but discovered that the puppet walked, had a life of its own, and was surprisingly willful.

The business of the university is truth which it engages either to preserve or to find. The efficient force in a university is generated by scholars, who behave largely independently but under rules which we call the laws of science or the rules of evidence. Under these laws, each scholar mines his own data and interprets them under rules of parsimony. For the scholar, the sin against the Holy Ghost is faithlessness to the data, and any scholar who is unwilling to follow the data where they lead, but rather stretches or withholds evidence to save a preconception, is made, like Pinocchio, to look foolish. Each of us knows of, or may be, a scholar who has had his nose out of joint because reviews were bad. But if our mistakes have been honest ones, the corrective force that comes from exposing our ideas to public view is welcome. We can review the data, correct our errors, refashion our hypothesis and move again to the attack with renewed confidence. And for this reason, and not for the volume of pages, the rule of publish or perish has some validity—and the rule can be better applied to the entire enterprise of scholarship than to the career of an aspiring assistant professor.

The school or university is also a place where careers are planned. The most noble objective of scholarship is truth. But usefulness is a handmaiden not to be despised. And from the beginning usefulness has been an expected virtue. The professions of church, law and medicine were the central concern of the early university. To these we have added engineering, business, agriculture, journalism, to name a few. In preparation for each profession there is a body of knowledge and a skill or an art of doing. Though we often try to make invidious distinctions between pure and applied sciences, there is substance at one edge and technique at the other for the historian as well as the engineer. At the outer edge where we are most specialized and where we are most proud, we are all professionals. We all sell our services, and we are or can be worthy of our hire.

In more modern times, the society that supports and continuously recreates us is very different from the simple society that first saw cities rise in response to awakening trade and commerce. Now the goods that fill the arteries of commerce are so transformed by technology that the raw product is completely disguised. Who would have envisioned raw petroleum transformed into nylon fabrics or have believed that plastics could be made to sing? That metal wings could carry 300 people and tons of baggage? The goods we sell nowadays are products of ideas impressed on nature rather than products of a free nature. And we have learned to expect that we can do anything–travel through space, live under water, mine the sea, free ourselves from the limitations that gravity and time have imposed upon us. But though we may seem to be wonder-working giants when we pool our specialized skills, in isolation we are pygmies. One blackout in the Northeast, or the failure of a carburetor on a modern freeway, reminds us that, adaptive as we may be as homo sapiens, we are far too specialized now to survive the loss of our technology. So the analogue to the medieval walled town is, for the modern entrepreneur, the university. The faubourgs of brain industries grow up "alongside its outer ivied walls" seeking the protection, the support and the injections of newly discovered truths or techniques. And the cycle of the scholar's life seems to have gone full circle so that in relation to the contemporary society, a university is both creature and creator.

For the school there are two classes of scholars–the teachers and the learners. In most of the literature the student is the undergraduate, and if a graduate mission changes the traditional ecological conditions of the undergraduate, the standard reaction is horror. One would judge from casual observation that graduate education was an intrusion, not healthy, not necessary, but rather threatening to the success of the institution's central mission. Yet graduate education is a logical, natural, necessary adaptation to expanding possibilities, expanding opportunities, and expanding imperatives in modern life. From their first invention universities have been a response to societal needs. They have not been static. The body of knowledge taught in 1492 would be represented at best by a vestige in 1942. Yet the university of 1492 and the university of 1942, so different from each other, were both universities for their time and their time's needs. And the charge of irrelevance was for each equally true and equally false. The changes in the quarter century since 1942 have been greater than for any like time in the history of higher education. And these changes have made the graduate program inevitable. Graduate education must be accepted as an integral part of our modern obligation. If it is treated gingerly as an unwelcome threat to nostalgic memories of quieter, happier undergraduate peace, future education will not be adjusted to the requirements of the school, the scholar, or the society.

We not only have more knowledge to bring within our purview, we are now committed to universal opportunity. This is not quite the same as universal higher education, but it does press to a broader mission. One of the misfortunes of this new circumstance is that those who ask and deserve equal opportunity from universities are not equally prepared to participate. And from this unequal preparation arises a crisis of relevance.

Education is not an absolute good, prepared and packaged for delivery in standard sizes. It is a means to serve our ends. If the end is mathematical skill, the education must be designed to reach down to meet the student. If the instruction is not related to the student's level of preparation, it is irrelevant. If after reaching him it does not stretch him, it is again irrelevant.

Our problem of numbers is not just that there are more bodies, but that there are many more and different minds differently prepared, coming from different milieux and bringing different expectations, and that they, or many of them, must be taken farther than ever was true before.

Everywhere one hears talk of relevance these days. Often the word is a stereotype in the mouths of dissenters. But we do need to ask to what our educational program relates. The obvious first checking point is the ability of the student; the second is his objective; the third may be society's objective. Immediacy and relevance are only accidentally coincident. Dante remains relevant wherever the human spirit needs stretching, and I need not be Italian, and late medieval at that, to profit from his writings.

The problem of the inner city is an appropriate concern of scholarship; and so are drugs; and so is war; and so are law and order; and freedom and its challenge or contribution to order. Life is filled with imperatives that require immediate attention. Listen to Ortega:

> Life cannot wait until the sciences have explained the universe scientifically. We cannot put off living until we are ready. The most salient characteristic of life is its coerciveness: it is always urgent, "here and now" without possible postponement. Life is fired at us point blank. And culture, which is its interpretation, cannot wait anymore than can life itself.

But how does the university facilitate work on immediate problems? Does it mount crusades for social ends? If so, how does one identify consensus in the confusion of different, individual, strongly held convictions that so characterize a faculty? The normal process of seeking corporate consensus in a university usually engulfs the energies of affected scholars and, for the time, paralyzes the efficient forces upon which the university and the society depend. Moreover, crusading, except for the freedom of its scholars, is inappropriate to the role of a university. The corporate university exists to assure a proper climate for, and to facilitate the work of, scholars who are as individuals the efficient force in the academic enterprise. They should, by definition, be of such varying interests that consensus should not be easy. In such an environment, teacher scholars and apprentice scholars should grow toward wisdom together. And with their own wisdom, freely and individually applied, they should try to cure the social malaise. It is by scholar-making that the university helps fashion the units by and from which a better society can be built.

The university has come to be the preferred instrument for building and governing society, for preparing scholars, and for preparing men for the professions. Indeed, the most likely immediate response to any need for manpower building has been to create a new academic discipline, or a new multidiscipline combination, and to ask the old curricula to move over and make room for the innovation. In fact, however, many of our manpower requirements might better be cared for outside the university structure. Our automatic recourse to the university is an expression of our preference for using gadgets we are familiar with rather than thinking hard about new approaches to recalcitrant problems.

We do have tremendous and unrealistic faith in gadgets. If a school board finds the system for which it is responsible faltering because of population shifts, or tax failure, or faulty personnel, it is disposed to seek advice from management consultants. In an example brought to my attention only recently, three confused assistant superintendents were joined by four new assistants under a new organization chart, so that now there are seven confused assistant superintendents. Such a change in an organization chart is too frequently a substitute for change in district policy. Meanwhile, the hard problem that led to the study in the first place is still out there in the real world waiting to be solved. But the board is satisfied that it is doing something, although its energy has been diverted from the social problem to district reorganization. The result is a new administrative gadget and a problem still unresolved.

In similar vein, if there is juvenile delinquency, we pass a law. If there is a conflict among universities, we create a coordinating board. If social injustice becomes burdensome enough, we try a revolution. But after the law is passed, the coordinating board created, or the revolution tried, the substantial problems underlying the unrest still remain to be solved, and no gadgets, however prestigious, can take the place of difficult analysis and uncomfortable, awkward, essential reform mandated by one or more officers who have been willing to work their ways free from the confusion. The gadget is more frequently an anodyne to the public conscience than an instrument for efficient reform. And when the gadget is a coordinating board, the hardest possible educational decision is placed on the shoulders of an agency which, judged by its record, can attract less distinguished personnel than can the beleaguered universities, colleges, and legislative committees it is expected to advise or coordinate.

We do need division of labor among educational institutions as well as among men. Daniel Bell has stated the case succinctly:

> If there is to be a national university system, then we need to initiate more sustained thought about its desirable shape. Should graduate schools and their research preoccupations be linked with large undergraduate colleges? Should one not have two kinds of graduate schools, one for detailed research training and one for broader education? What is the optimal size of a single campus? What kind of division of labor can be created among

universities as regards concentrations in different fields? Should some kinds of research be detached from universities and lodged either in government, in non-profit institutions, or in some kind of academy structure?

These are questions about structure and function. But if one goes further and links them to the question of legitimacy, one should, perhaps, grasp the nettle and make some further, broad distinctions. Can one give all universities, private and state, small and large, elite and mass, liberal arts and junior colleges, the same cloak of immunity and privilege that is worn in the classical model? What is academic freedom in a junior college and does this differ from the citizenship of a corporation employee to speak his mind politically? Does membership in a faculty, with its privileges, extend to teaching assistants and librarians? In the present-day idea of a university we have a hollow ideology which is contradicted by a complex reality.

For the sake of argument, what would a national university system look like if divided along the lines of legitimacy that I have proposed? In effect, we would have three different systems:

a) an autonomous system of elite universities and liberal-arts colleges whose justifications would lie in their allegiance to the classic pursuits of truth and scholarship and would be recipient of its immunities.

b) a large-scale system of state universities and junior colleges whose functions would be primarily professional and technical training.

c) a large-scale research and service system which would be client-oriented, to the government, to industry, to the minorities, whose function would be primarily that of applying knowledge to technological and social situations.

The system I have outlined so schematically is open, of course, to the charge of elitism. It is subject, more seriously, to the accusation that in the character of knowledge and its application such distinctions are false and unreal. Perhaps. Each of these arguments is debatable. But the simple point is that these issues have never really been debated. If one is to think seriously of a national system of higher education, serving

> various purposes in a meaningful division of labor, surely we must initiate this kind of debate.[1]

In such a division of labor it might be possible for quite different institutions to get the satisfaction and respect that are born of being highly useful. Then each institution might be content to magnify its own calling rather than to fall prey to the university syndrome, the siren effect of which has made pale imitations of Harvard out of vigorous, sometimes thorny but productive regional institutions designed for manpower preparation. Differences might develop from internal decisions instead of being externally imposed. Rather than differences in entitlement to offer advanced degrees there would be differences in objectives of degrees, the objectives selected in relation to discerned need rather than as a response to tradition and prestige. There just might be greater social profit and therefore more genuine efficiency from a system that invited administrators in each institution to think constructively and autonomously than can be expected when control is placed in a coordinating officer and board and the colleges are asked to respond and conform. We need more ideas and originality, not less; and there is no clear evidence that division of labor and competition are less productive in education than elsewhere in a free society.

Bell's invitation to a free discussion about a national university system is one I applaud. My own first contribution would be to suggest that even his formulation of the problem, wise as I believe it to be, is too confining. Our educational problems arise not only from lack of system but also from unjust distribution of opportunities among our people. They arise, too, from a cultural disposition to respond to any social shortcoming with a new course in college, or a complete new college in which to accommodate the course. Why do we believe that all good things must come in standard sizes? If we need new cohorts for industry, subprofessional engineers for example, the response of having quarter or semester courses organized into two-year curricula may make sense. But it may not. Some of our people, neglected too long, may be forgiven if they are impatient. Why could not some good things come in six-week, seven-month, or ten-and-a-half-month packages? Why should all manpower problems be referred to conventional academic men or institutions? The primary relevance problem may be to trim the preparation time, content, and objectives to proportions related to the needs of a society that is composed, in at least equal numbers, of men and women who want the tools and skill of a trade, and the opportunity to use them profitably and usefully.

In the early years of our republic, John Adams wrote to his wife Abigail:

> The mechanic arts are those which we have occasion for in a young country as yet simple and not far advanced in luxury. I must study politics and war, that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy, geography, natural history and naval architecture, navigation, commerce and

---

[1] Daniel Bell, "By Whose Right?" (for CFAT Fall Board Meeting, Nov. 1969).

> agriculture, in order to give their children a right to study painting, poetry, music, architecture, statuary, tapestry and porcelain.

John Adams was a wise man; he saw an order of priority for educators in a young country, and he longed for the day when his children's children could study painting, poetry, music, tapestry and porcelain. We are those children and we can study the arts of which he dreamed. But we must also, and at the same time, study politics and war as well as mathematics, philosophy, natural history, agriculture and commerce. And we must also build a cadre of craftsmen with pride in themselves and their lives. And we must build educational institutions to provide the full variety of skills. And we must raise a breed of educators each of whom can draw satisfaction from performing well his role in a labor which must be divided according to specialized functions in order to be successful. And somehow we must shake free from the university syndrome so that we can honor education for its contribution to present need, not for its conformity to an older conception of prestige.

CONTRIBUTORS. . . . .

William B. Boyd is Central Michigan University's president.

Herman R. Branson is president of Central State University in Wilberforce, Ohio.

Albert Brown holds the presidency at State University College at Brockport, New York.

Edward Callan is president of the Association of Student Governments.

Harold B. Crosby is president of the University of West Florida.

William E. Davis is president of Idaho State University.

Frank Dickey is the executive director of the National Commission on Accrediting in Washington, D.C.

E. Alden Dunham is an executive associate of the Carnegie Corporation of New York and author of "Colleges of the Forgotten Americans," published by McGraw-Hill.

The Reverend Clarence W. Friedman is the executive secretary of the division of higher education, National Catholic Educational Association.

Winfred L. Godwin is the director of the Southern Regional Education Board.

Fred F. Harcleroad is president of the American College Testing Program and co-author, with H. Bradley Sagen and C. Theodore Molen, Jr., of "The Developing State Colleges and Universities."

Jack Harrison is director of studies of the Christian Faith and Higher Education Institute.

James A. Hayes is director of Central Michigan University's office of grants and special studies.

Watts Hill, Jr. is with the North Carolina Board of Higher Education.

William Martin is chief of the United States Office of Education's overseas projects branch.

Ernest D. Mason is a member of the student government of North Carolina Central University.

Edgar Masterson is assistant to the president of California's Chico State College.

E. Lee McLean is Northwestern University's development consultant.

G. Theodore Mitau is chancellor of the Minnesota State College Board.

Carlisle Parker coordinates programs for educational opportunities at New Jersey's Paterson State College.

Gwen Patton is national coordinator of the National Association of Black Students.

James A. Reid is assistant professor of sociology at Florida A&M University in Tallahassee.

Richard C. Van Dusen is under-secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Thomas Y. Whitley is president of Columbus College in Georgia.

O. Meredith Wilson is director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Palo Alto, California.

Paul Woodring is Distinguished Service Professor at Western Washington State College and editor-at-large of the Saturday Review.